ILLINOIS

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

PRODUCTION NOTE

University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign Library
Large-scale Digitization Project, 2007.

Standards for Library and Information Services

TERRY L. WEECH
Issue Editor

Library Trends

Summer 1982

Library Trends

(ISSN 0024-2594)

LIBRARY TRENDS, a quarterly journal of librarianship, provides a medium for evaluative recapitulation of current thought and practice, searching for those ideas and procedures which hold the greatest potentialities for the future.

Each issue is concerned with one aspect of librarianship. Each is planned with the assistance of an invited advisory editor. All articles are by invitation. Suggestions for future issues are welcomed and should be sent to the Managing Editor.

Published four times a year, in summer, fall, winter, and spring. Office of publication: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 249 Armory Bldg., 505 E. Armory St., Champaign, IL 61820. Entered as second-class matter under the act of August 24, 1912.

Subscription price is $20.00 a year (plus $1.00 postage for overseas subscribers). Individual issues are priced at $5.00. All foreign subscriptions and orders should be accompanied by payment. Address orders to Journals Department, University of Illinois Press, 54 E. Gregory Drive, Box 5081, Station A, Champaign, IL 61820. Editorial correspondence should be sent to Publications Office—*Library Trends*, 249 Armory Bldg., 505 E. Armory St., Champaign, IL 61820.

Indexed in *Current Contents, Current Index to Journals in Education, Library and Information Science Abstracts, Library Literature, PAIS*, and *Social Sciences Citation Index*.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Library Trends

VOLUME 31 NUMBER 1

SUMMER 1982

University of Illinois
Graduate School of Library and Information Science

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Standards for Library and Information Services

TERRY L. WEECH
Issue Editor

CONTENTS

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Introduction

TERRY L. WEECH

IN THE DECADE SINCE Felix Hirsch edited the October 1972 *Library Trends* on "Standards for Libraries," there has been considerable activity in the library and information science profession relating to the subject. Given the scope of these activities, it was decided to approach the subject of standards in two separate issues of *Library Trends*. This issue will concentrate on service or performance standards as related to specific types of libraries. The Fall 1982 issue of *Library Trends* will focus on technical and procedural standards that apply in many different library and information science settings, and will be edited by James E. Rush. There undoubtedly will be some overlap between the articles in the two issues, but the authors were asked to keep the focus of each issue in mind as they prepared their articles. It is the hope of the editors that these two issues of *Library Trends* will complement each other and provide a comprehensive view of developments and trends in standards relating to library and information science.

Felix Hirsch provides an excellent review of the definition of *standards* and related terms in his introduction to the 1972 issue.[1] No attempt will be made to duplicate his discussion here. Many of the concerns of the 1972 *Library Trends* on "Standards for Libraries" are still evident in the content of the articles written for this issue of *Library Trends*. The value of standards continues to be debated. In fact, the use of the term *standard* has been avoided by some, with *guideline* or *mission statement* a preferred substitute. The Public Library Associa-

Terry L. Weech is Associate Professor, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

tion has, at least for the moment, rejected traditional standards entirely and has developed a planning procedure with evaluation based on output measures as an alternative to traditional standards. Other types of libraries will undoubtedly be watching this development with interest. Although there has been considerable movement away from quantitative standards, the debate over the desirability of quantitative or qualitative standards is far from over. If public libraries may serve as a model, one wonders if a "new federalism" in library standards might lead to qualitative national standards and quantitative state and regional standards. Concern over the method by which standards are developed was evident in 1972, and is evident in the current group of articles. The importance of a "research" base for standards has been emphasized by authors then as now.

But there have been many changes and new developments since 1972. Both the four-year and the two-year college library standards have been revised, and these revisions are discussed by David Kaser and James Wallace, respectively. Beverly Lynch reviews the development of the recent university library standards, and reports on a survey of perception of the usefulness of the new standards by directors of university libraries. Jane Hannigan provides an analysis of the development of school library media standards, and makes suggestions for possible future revisions. Robert Rohlf presents the story of the continuing evolution of public library standards from an emphasis on input measures to a focus on output measures. Rohlf reviews the revolution in orientation from uniform national public library standards to an individualized planning process that encourages each library to establish its own goals and guidelines. F. William Summers shares with us the deliberations involved in the development of standards for state libraries, including those relating to the recently abandoned effort to revise the existing standards for state libraries. James B. Dodd brings us up to date on standards—including the lack of standards—for special libraries. Stephen Prine and Kieth Wright review recent developments in standards for the visually and hearing impaired, and Richard Miller does the same for library services to people in institutions. Standards for health science libraries, including academic and special libraries serving the health sciences, are discussed by Ray Stinson. Catriona de Scossa and Mary E.P. Henderson review Canadian library standards, and Anthony Vaughan provides an overview of British library standards. International standards are discussed by Peter Havard-Williams.

It is hoped that this issue will provide the reader with a state-of-the-art report on library standards, and perhaps suggest some future trends in each of the respective areas covered. The issue editor wishes to thank

the authors for their contributions and their ready acceptance of the task of developing the articles. A special thanks is extended to the authors of the articles on Canadian, British and international standards for cheerfully fitting the reviews of the developments of their respective topics into the limited space of a journal article.

Reference

1. Hirsch, Felix E. "Introduction: Why Do We Need Standards?" *Library Trends* 21(Oct. 1972):159-63.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Standards for College Libraries

DAVID KASER

THE SEARCH FOR STANDARDS for American college libraries can boast a venerable and distinguished history spanning almost four-score years and challenging the intellects of some of the premier worthies both within and outside of the profession. Marked concurrently by considerable zeal on the one hand and by chronic frustration on the other, it has been likened to the Quest for the Holy Grail, although its partial success probably renders that simile inapt.

Much of the persistent frustration at the academic library community's inability to fashion tenable standards for itself can probably be attributed to the fact that it looks so deceptively easy. Like defining "pornography," the unwary falls easily into the trap of assuming that, given a little time and motivation, any modestly informed person could do it. Many knowledgeable librarians have tried unsuccessfully to make standards, however, and the very high failure rate among these efforts bespeaks clearly the formidable character of the task.

Although a definitive history of academic library standards-making remains to be written (indeed *deserves* to be written, probably as a dissertation), several helpful résumés have been prepared of the experience.[1] Although it is not a chore to be undertaken as a part of this paper,[2] a brief enumeration here of the early landmark efforts is useful in placing more recent labors and concerns into a time perspective.

David Kaser is Professor of Library and Information Science, Indiana University, Bloomington.

A Brief Background

During the first quarter of the twentieth century, all efforts to devise academic library standards took place in state and regional associations of colleges rather than in the library community, but the results were seldom, if ever, rigorous or demanding. Indeed, the most exacting among these early trials called only for minimum collections of "8000 volumes exclusive of public documents."[3] In the late 1920s, and with substantial funding from the Carnegie Corporation, a number of leading librarians also became exercised about the matter, and several draft sets of standards were produced. Carl Milam published his "Suggestions" in 1930, and William M. Randall issued his proposed standards as the concluding segment of his study of *The College Library* in 1932.[4] Randall's draft was reprinted and widely disseminated, although he never sought official adoption of it.

By the late 1930s, however, the regional accrediting associations, led primarily by the North Central Association, had largely given up imposing any specific requirements at all—including library requirements—upon their member institutions, and had chosen rather to develop more flexible bases for adjudging library adequacy in terms of institutional purpose. Although several leading librarians aided and supported this newer concept, most were uneasy about forgoing specific, hard-number requirements, feeling that without them, "standards" were reduced to well-intentioned and high-sounding, but largely feckless, platitudes.[5]

As a result, in 1943 the ALA adopted its own specific numerical standards for academic library book collections, staffing patterns, salaries, and book funds.[6] Hard minimum numbers for book collections, professional staff size, percentage of institutional budget to be allocated to libraries, and number of library seats were subsequently incorporated into the ALA "Standards for College Libraries" adopted in 1959.[7] The 1975 revision of these standards, which remains in force today, specified numerical requirements for book collections, professional staff size, and building size.[8]

Thus, for almost forty years academic librarians have, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, espoused some quantitative standards for their libraries. For a like period, however, regional accrediting agencies have eschewed them. Although relations between the two groups have been marked throughout the years by considerable dialogue, substantial cooperation and notable goodwill, neither side has felt constrained to move toward the position of the other. Librarians feel that their opera-

tions must be judged against quantitative standards; associations of colleges feel just as strongly that they must not.

Qualitative versus Quantitative Standards

It has been the aggregate judgment of the academic library community that, to be most useful, standards must comprise both qualitative and quantitative elements. Qualitative standards for libraries are easy to draft, and they easily gain consensual support. Almost everyone in higher education will agree that a college should have a "good" library. Vast disagreement arises, however, as soon as someone tries to attach numbers to the degree of "goodness" agreed upon, as soon as someone proposes that it is patently not possible to offer baccalaureate work with a library of fewer than x number of volumes, no matter how carefully chosen those volumes may be. Immediately a chorus begins—"How did you arrive at x?"; "I believe y is a better number"; "I vote for z"—except that the chorus is not orchestrated. Everyone has his own number, born of his own personal experience, predilections and insights. The preponderance of librarians, however, appears to subscribe to the notion that in certain aspects of library service (such as collection or staff sizes) quality and quantity are separable only in theory, and that although it is possible to have quantity without quality, it is not possible to have quality without a definable irreducible quantity.

Key questions, of course, exist as to who should determine irreducible quantities, and how they should go about doing it. There may have been a time in the adolescence of the profession when such quantities could be determined *ex cathedra* on the basis of expert testimony, as William Warner Bishop could opine that "the college with less than a hundred thousand volumes is but ill prepared to give modern work in the humanities and in sciences."[9] A half-century of democratization in the library community, however, has reduced even experts to "one-man, one-vote" status, and probably eliminated such sources from the profession's tool-kit forever.

Quantitative standards, in recent decades, have sprung from the aggregate experience of the profession—to the degree that can be determined—rather than from the experience of individual experts. Standards must, almost by definition, arise from the possible; here, as in medicine, prescription can arise only out of previous description. Thus, the more the academic library industry knows about itself, the better able it will be to define its "normality," to identify "normal behavior" among libraries, and then to expect it as a prerequisite to peer group

acceptance. If this suggests a strong relationship between quantitative standards and norms, so be it.

Preparing the 1975 Revision

In her excellent article in the October 1972 *Library Trends*, Helen M. Brown described thoroughly the antecedents and the intent of the 1959 "Standards for College Libraries," as well as their use up to 1972. The present report will begin where her account left off, with preparation of the current revision of the "Standards," how it came into being after 1972, and its impact upon college libraries up to the present time.

Brown reported the appointment in 1968 of an Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) subcommittee to prepare a revision of the 1959 "Standards." That year, however, saw the beginning of a period of revolution in American society, and codified standards, as codified laws, tend to be unpopular in times of revolution. Thus, in an effort to reflect the spirit of the era, that subcommittee brought in a draft not of hard standards, but of general recommendations, which it denominated "Guidelines for College Libraries." By the time the document was completed and presented to the ACRL college section membership for approbation in June 1971, however, the "revolution" had ended, and the group rejected the draft on precisely the basis that had first been considered its strength, namely, its avoidance of quantitative requirements.

It took ACRL some time to regroup, but by mid-1973 the association had received one of the J. Morris Jones—World Book Encyclopedia—ALA Goals Awards (an award renewed the following year) and had appointed a new ad hoc committee to revise the 1959 standards with Johnnie Givens in the chair. In planning its work, the new revision committee determined that it would observe certain principles throughout. These principles were as follows:

1. the revision would be sufficiently flexible to allow for variation based upon the unique purposes and profiles of individual institutions;
2. the revision would contain both qualitative and quantitative components;
3. the document would be brief and couched in terminology which was comprehensible to informed laymen;
4. wherever possible the revision would be capable of accommodating likely future developments;
5. the revision would be sufficiently "political" to gain the approbation of ACRL;

6. since the committee was unable to engage in original research on its own recognizance, the revision would reflect only existing knowledge or belief.

There was nothing new about these principles; implicitly or explicitly they were similar to those that had guided the 1959 standards committee as well.

Similarities between the 1959 standards and the resulting 1975 revision are substantial. Both begin with definitions of the kinds of institutions they are designed to cover. Both address directly the issues of collections, staff, buildings, budgets, administration, and services. The 1959 document also contained a standard on interlibrary cooperation, but this is omitted in the 1975 text because cooperation was felt by the revision committee to be a *means*—an important means perhaps, but nonetheless a means, rather than an end in itself. Both contain quantitative requirements concerning collections, staff and buildings. The 1959 rendition also included a quantitative statement on the percentage of institutional expenditure to be allocated to libraries, but in 1975 this is relegated to an accompanying gloss.

There are also a number of notable differences between the two sets of standards. Among the more obvious differences are the format and auxiliary verb forms used in the two texts. In 1959 a continuous textual format was used, but the 1975 committee, concluding that some parts of its document were requirements while other parts were exegesis, divided the document into two sections: "Standards," and an accompanying "Commentary" which attempted briefly to explain the rationale for the standards. This separation permits all standards to use the auxiliary verb form *shall* (reserved, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, "for solemn assertions of the certainty of future events") rather than the somewhat weaker form *should*.

It was the revision committee's judgment that, although the qualitative components of the new standards could be stated in uniform language and still be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the idiosyncrasies of individual colleges, institutional uniqueness would necessitate variant treatments in the quantitative standards. The 1959 document, for example, had based the library collection size requirement upon the single institutional variable of enrollment. However, subsequent experience—recorded first in the Clapp-Jordan concept,[10] and later verified and adapted in several state education agencies[11]—had identified several other institutional characteristics that affect collection size, and had determined appropriate weightings to accompany those characteristics. Thus, the 1975 revision bases an institution's collection

expectation not only on its enrollment, but also on the size of its teaching faculty and the level and extent of its academic program.

The 1959 document also used enrollment as the only institutional variable in determining the number of seats in the library building. Again, however, subsequent experience, as documented both in textbooks and in the work of several state agencies,[12] enabled the revision committee to take institutional profiles more fully into account, and to provide a fuller basis for adjudging the spatial adequacy of library buildings.

Insofar as staff size is concerned, the 1959 standards had called simply for a minimum of three librarians, and in its initial deliberations the 1975 committee could find no sound statistical basis for enlarging upon that requirement. Under membership pressure that arose late in its work, however, the committee was obliged to provide an expanded formula anyway, and Standard 4 (Formula B) was developed, taking into account not only enrollment, but also collection size and growth rate. Although the committee was reasonably confident that these were likely the appropriate factors to be considered, it was unable, within its resources or the time available, to refine or confirm the weightings which were incorporated into the final formula. Thus, unlike Formulas A and C, Formula B rests on a somewhat shaky foundation, and will probably be the first to fall in the face of rigorous research.

A major innovation in the 1975 revision was the provision of letter grades representing the degrees to which individual libraries fulfilled these three quantitative standards. Borrowed from its earlier application to college libraries by the New York State Department of Education,[13] this scheme for the first time provided for all libraries, except the few that met fully the numerical requirement (and are likely to be too proud to slacken their efforts anyway), a continuing stimulus to seek improvement. In determining the percentages of fulfillment that would qualify for particular letter grades, the committee simply took current Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) statistics and "forced" bell-curves so that approximately 12 percent of all covered colleges would receive *A*s, 20 percent *B*s, 35 percent *C*s, and 20 percent *D*s, while 12 percent would prove unacceptable. The general growth of collections since that time has no doubt resulted in some "grade inflation" in that category; staff reductions, on the other hand, may have brought about some deflation there.[14] At any rate, periodic review and revision will be needed to keep these grading percentages useful.

Some other, less obvious differences between the 1959 and the 1975 standards include:

1. the 1975 standards do not require a college to hold legal title to the books made available to its students as long as the books are well selected and can be supplied as quickly as if they were college property;
2. the 1975 standards permit collections to assume "no-growth" status after the numerical requirement is fulfilled;
3. online catalogs and joint catalogs of the holdings of several institutions are allowed in the revision;
4. students as well as faculty are now called for on library advisory committees;
5. the librarian may now report to the "chief academic officer of the institution" in lieu of the president;
6. it is no longer necessary for librarians to be on duty at all hours that the library is open; and
7. the 1975 rendition mandates that an institution's nonprint resources be administered by the library.

Understandably, the 1959 and 1975 renditions also differed somewhat in the emphasis each placed upon certain aspects of library activity so as to reflect the sixteen years of changes that had occurred in the college environment. The revision, for example, lays greater stress on the faculty character of the librarian's task and on the library needs of students in extension centers than had the 1959 standards.

Gaining Approval of the Revision

It is the fate of library standards in the United States that they can be effective only through the moral suasion that they can bring to bear upon the library peer community. Many have wished that an appropriate body would assume responsibility for the hard enforcement of academic library standards, but that seems highly unlikely to occur here for a long time to come. Unlike a ministry of education, the U.S. federal government lacks Constitutional authority to impose its will upon colleges. State governments, moreover, control only their state-supported institutions, and regional accrediting agencies have long been unwilling to be specific in their requirements. Thus, the full burden of gaining implementation of the college library standards lies, as it has for a half-century, upon the shoulders of the peer group of academic libraries, and peer groups rely heavily upon persuasion and pressure to attain homogeneity before they resort to ostracism. Thus, it is essential for any set of college library standards, if they are to have any effect at all, to gain majority approbation in ACRL.

As did the 1959 committee, therefore, so also did the revision committee take great pains to seek out the advice of a wide spectrum of interested groups and individuals and to keep relevant publics informed at every point in its deliberations. Innumerable ideas and suggestions were forthcoming in the many meetings and public hearings that were held, and heavy correspondence resulted from the circulation of early drafts. *CRL News* reported on one session held by the committee with representatives of professional associations and accrediting bodies, noting that "a faculty member attacked the standards for being too weak on faculty status, college officials challenged them for meddling in the affairs of presidents and boards of trustees, and library administrators criticized them for prescribing how a library should be run."[15] Continuing and ad hoc pressure groups filed reports calling for stronger statements of concern in their areas of special interest. Enthusiasts for bibliographic instruction, interlibrary cooperation, faculty status, intellectual freedom, and a host of other issues helped the committee understand more fully the significance of their concerns. Most respondents felt that the numerical requirements proposed were either too high or too low, or were inappropriate, or should be recast. Several librarians supplied copies of standards that they themselves had written, suggesting that these standards be substituted for the committee's rendition.

All of these responses, of course, helped in their way to sharpen the committee's working drafts, to bring them more fully into accord with latent professional consensus, and ultimately, to make its revision tolerable to a substantial majority of the persons in attendance at the ACRL 1975 membership meeting in San Francisco. This last draft was then formally adopted by the ACRL Board of Directors at the same conference on July 3.

Subsequent Developments

The 1975 standards were put to work immediately. Local libraries applied them to themselves for purposes of upgrading and development. States from Wisconsin to Mississippi used them to assess the quality of college library service within their boundaries. Their appearance was particularly timely for the massive study of all libraries in the nation, undertaken that year by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and published under the title *National Inventory of Library Needs, 1975*.[16] Members of the revision committee were called upon to advise in their implementation by individual institutions, by state agencies and by state and regional library associations.

The standards' influence was felt abroad as governments and library organizations in other countries reviewed them for ideas and concepts applicable elsewhere. In June 1979, the ACRL Board of Directors approved the recommendation of the ACRL Standards and Accreditation Committee that "An Evaluative Checklist for Reviewing a College Library Program" be adopted and published, and this was done.[17]

Lest the 1975 standards become dated or inapplicable, however, ACRL promptly appointed monitoring bodies to keep watch over them. An ad hoc group was appointed in 1976, with members drawn from ACRL's College Libraries Section and its Standards and Accreditation Committee, with instructions "to review, and to revise when necessary, the 1975 Standards for College Libraries."[18] Three years later the College Libraries Section also appointed its own ad hoc Committee on Standards and Guidelines for the College Library.[19] Both of these committees have made substantial studies in efforts to determine wherein revision appears to be warranted.

Generally speaking, all studies to date have reported fairly high levels of satisfaction among academic library directors with the effectiveness and appropriateness of the 1975 standards. The most comprehensive of these studies, conducted in 1981,[20] found that between 83 and 86 percent of college library directors felt that each of the eight numbered standards was either "useful" or "moderately useful." As regards the three quantitative requirements for collections, staff and building space, the same study found that 72, 78 and 80.2 percent, respectively, of responding library directors felt that they were either adequate or close to adequate. More than 94 percent claimed to be "familiar" with the standards, and only 13 percent reported that they had not used them in one way or another for the betterment of their libraries. A survey of the perceptions and use of the 1975 standards among directors of libraries in predominantly black colleges in several southeastern states reported somewhat similar findings, although at a little lower level of satisfaction.[21]

Meanwhile, a study comparing the three quantitative components of the 1975 standards against such data on these matters as could be gleaned from the 1977 HEGIS reports confirmed the intent of the revision committee that only small percentages of American college libraries would meet 100 percent of the formulas, earning, in effect, grades of "A."[22]

Efforts to use the 1975 standards and studies into their effectiveness have revealed occasional misunderstandings regarding them, misunderstandings which may arise either out of their lack of clarity or out of

careless reading of them. Among the most frequently recurring misunderstandings are the following.

1. Although in the "Commentary on Standard 8," a statement is made that "library budgets...which fall below six percent of the college's total educational and general expenditures are seldom able to sustain the range of library programs required by the institution,"[23] this is not a standard, it is simply an observation.
2. Likewise, where the "Commentary on Standard 2" avers that collections "can seldom retain their requisite utility without sustaining annual gross growth rates, before withdrawals, of at least five percent,"[24] no standard is being stated; this is a simple assertion.
3. Microform materials can be counted toward fulfillment of the collection requirement through the use of a volume-equivalency conversion ratio incorporated into Standard 2, Formula A.

Future users and students of the 1975 standards should be cautious to note these areas of potential confusion, and future revisers should take care to make them clearer.

The Future

It is probably unrealistic to hope that the 1975 standards will serve for sixteen years, as did the 1959 standards; changes are taking place in the environment too fast today to permit that to happen. The revision committee aspired to produce a document that would last for ten years, and that hope now appears likely of fulfillment. Seven years have passed already, and since both of the previous drafts required two years from assignment to adoption, the 1975 revision seems certain to serve for at least nine years, even if a new revision were to be commissioned today.

At any rate, it is reassuring to see that ACRL has appointed committees to review the current utility of the 1975 document and to recommend such changes as are warranted. The 1975 document itself pointed to some additional areas wherein standards even then appeared needed, if it had been possible to develop them. "These include measures of library effectiveness and productivity," it states in its introduction, "the requisite extent and configuration of nonprint resources and services, and methods for program evaluation."[25] The recent study by Hardesty and Bentley indicated continued high interest in developing standards on these matters, but only "medium" optimism that it is possible even today to find sufficient industry-wide consensus to permit their promulgation.

Research findings, of course, which can substitute sure and certain knowledge for opinion, belief and faith, should provide the proper foundations for quantitative standards. The advent over the last couple of decades, slow though it may have been, of more sophisticated and powerful research methodologies onto the library scene augurs well for future standards-makers. Optimizing and regression techniques, modeling, input/output analyses, and other research processes utilizing the capabilities of the computer, all promise better and more tenable standards in the years ahead.

There will continue to be the inevitable time lags between the discovery of new knowledge and its admittance into the professional canon, as well as between attainment at the theoretical level and utilization at the applied level. It takes time for knowledge to displace popular belief, especially knowledge originating in the rarified atmosphere of the research laboratory. Standards in the future, as have standards in the past, will require consensual support to be effective, and consensus comes only through diffusion and adoption. Those tend to be slow processes indeed.

It also appears that college library standards could be better written if the college library community could agree on a specific purpose for them. Different librarians want standards for different purposes; indeed, often the same librarian wants standards for different purposes at different times, as perhaps to prove to his colleagues how good his library is, and to his president how poor it is.

This diversity of intent is well expressed in an oft-quoted statement introducing the *Standards for South African Public Libraries*: "Standards may be interpreted variously as the pattern of an ideal, a model procedure, a measure for appraisal, a stimulus for future development and improvement, and as an instrument to assist decision and action not only by librarians themselves but by laymen concerned indirectly with the institution, planning, and administration of...library services."[26] Now that is a lot to expect from a single document. An "ideal" is, by definition, unattainable, but an attainable goal serves much better as a "stimulus" for improvement than an unattainable goal. The 1975 document emphasized the stimulation of improvement, and in so doing presented a set of conditions which a few bellwether libraries may already have fulfilled, thereby denying to that small minority the benefit of stimulation made available to the majority. In that sense, the present standards are not of equal utility to all institutions. Whether or not future standards-makers will be able to redress this inequity remains to be seen.

References

1. For history of academic library standards-making, *see* Brown, Helen M. "College Library Standards." *Library Trends* 21(Oct. 1972):204-18; Hirsch, Felix E. "Library Standards." In *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*, vol. 16, edited by Allen Kent, pp. 49-51. New York: Dekker, 1975; and Kaser, David. "A Century of Academic Librarianship, as Reflected in Its Literature." *College & Research Libraries* 37(March 1976):110-27.

2. For more information, *see* Milam, Carl H. "Suggestions for Minimum College Library Standards." *ALA College and Reference Library Yearbook* 2(1930):90-92; "Selected Bibliography." In *College and University Library Accreditation Standards-1957* (ACRL Monograph, No. 20), compiled by Eli M. Oboler, et al., pp. 39-44. Chicago: ACRL, 1958; Ottersen, Signe. "A Bibliography on Standards for Evaluating Libraries." *College & Research Libraries* 32(March 1971):127-44; and listings under appropriate terms in the DIALOG Information Services database. (Anyone wishing to make an exhaustive search, however, should be cautioned that none of these lists is comprehensive.)

3. Reported *in* Milam, "Suggestions," p. 90, for the Association of American Universities, the Middle States Association, and the North Central Association. By 1930, however, the Southern Association was requiring 12,000 vols.

4. Randall, William M. *The College Library*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932, pp. 140-42.

5. Until 1934, North Central Association's library standard read as follows: "The college shall have a live, well-distributed, professionally administered library of at least 8,000 volumes exclusive of public documents, bearing specifically upon the subjects taught and with a definite annual appropriation for the purchase of new books and current periodicals. It is urged that such appropriation be at least five dollars per student registered." Its "Statement of Policy" adopted in 1934, however, observed only that: "The library should provide the reading facilities needed to make the educational program effective, and there should be evidence that such facilities are appropriately used." (Quoted *in* George F. Zook and M.E. Haggerty. *Principles of Ations*. The Evaluation of Higher Institutions, vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936, p. 119.)

6. American Library Association. Salaries, Staff and Tenure Board. Subcommittee on Budgets, Compensation, and Schemes of Service. *Classification and Pay Plans for Libraries in Institutions of Higher Education, Vol. 2: Degree-Conferring Four-Year Institutions*. Chicago: ALA, 1943.

7. "Standards for College Libraries." *College & Research Libraries* 20(July 1959):274-80.

8. "Standards for College Libraries." *College & Research Libraries News* 36(Oct. 1975):277-79+; and *Standards for College Libraries*. Chicago: ACRL, 1975.

9. Bishop, William W. "Our College and University Libraries—A Survey and a Program." *School and Society* 12(18 Sept. 1920):209.

10. Clapp, Verner W., and Jordan, Robert T. "Quantitative Criteria for Adequacy of Academic Library Collections." *College & Research Libraries* 26(Sept. 1965):371-80.

11. *See, for example,* Interinstitutional Committee of Business Officers. "A Model Budget Analysis for Program 05 Libraries." Mimeographed. Seattle: University of Washington, 1970.

12. *See, for example*: University of California. "Planning Guide for Libraries." Mimeographed. Berkeley: UC, 1968; and State University of New York. "Space Projection Criteria for Capital and Long Range Facilities Planning Purposes," n.d., pp. 15-16.

13. Kaser, David. "Report of the Advisory Committee on Planning for the Academic Libraries of New York State." Albany, N.Y.: State Education Department, 1973, p. 19.

14. Contrary to expectation, however, these figures had apparently risen by 1977. Whether or not they subsequently declined (as is hypothesized here) remains to be determined. *See* Carpenter, Ray L. "College Libraries: A Comparative Analysis in Terms of the ACRL Standards." *College & Research Libraries* 42(Jan. 1981):12.

15. Wright, Christopher. "Inside Washington." *College & Research Libraries News* 36(Jan. 1975):4.

16. National Council on Libraries and Information Science. *National Inventory of Library Needs, 1975*. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1977.

17. ACRL Standards and Accreditation Committee. "An Evaluative Checklist for Reviewing a College Library Program." *College & Research Libraries News* 40(Nov. 1979):305-16.

18. *ALA Handbook of Organization, 1980/81*. Chicago: ALA, 1980, p. 48.

19. Ibid., pp. 52-53.

20. Hardesty, Larry, and Bentley, Stella. "The Use and Effectiveness of the 1975 'Standards for College Libraries' " (Paper presented at the ACRL Second National Conference, 2-3 Oct. 1981, Minneapolis, Minn.).

21. Lewis, Jannith. "Strategies for Attaining Quantitative Adequacy in the Collections of Selected Undergraduate Liberal Arts College Libraries Evaluated by College Library Standards," Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1981.

22. Carpenter, "College Libraries."

23. *Standards for College Libraries*, 1975, p. 12.

24. Ibid., p. 5.

25. Ibid., p. 3.

26. South African Library Association. Subcommittee of Public Library Standards. *Standards for South African Public Libraries*, 2d rev. ed. Potchefstroom, South Africa: SALA, 1968, p. 11.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Two-Year College Learning Resources Standards

JAMES O. WALLACE

STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO two-year colleges are at the same time the oldest and the most recent of the current academic library standards. This seeming paradox is possible because the current standards were approved in 1972 (prior to either the present college or the university library standards), and because they were supplemented by quantitative standards in 1979 and underwent a review process for the basic document in 1981. The 1972 date is significant for two-year institutions, because the statement which was then adopted represented cooperation in development and endorsement by the three national associations most concerned.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) started the process which resulted in the basic standards statement in 1967. Their representatives were joined several years later by members of a task force appointed by the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT), who made significant contributions to the final document. Public hearings were conducted at the national meetings of all three associations before the final acceptance. It was not until 1972 that each association completed the approval process for the "Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs," as the statement was designated.[1] The name reflects the difference in philosophy and organizational structure between the two-year institution and other academic library standards.

James O. Wallace is Director of Learning Resources, San Antonio College, San Antonio, Texas.

"Guidelines" consists entirely of qualitative criteria to be applied to the colleges. In contrast to both the college and the university standards, no quantitative criteria were included in the basic document, no assumption is made that each two-year institution will be more or less identical to every other, and no pattern is prescribed for the administrative structure within the institution. All provision for learning resources made on the campus of any two-year college—public or private, community college or junior college, technical institute or two-year branch of a senior institution—is included. The document is concerned not only with a library or a learning resources center, but also with provision for learning resources, including audiovisual production and services, throughout the campus. Because it is concerned with all aspects of learning resources, wherever they may be located and however they may be placed in the institutional administrative structure, the "Guidelines" document is not just a library set of standards. Besides differing from standards for senior colleges and universities, "Guidelines" was a departure from previous standards for junior and community colleges. The history of standards for two-year institutions, including the development of "Guidelines" has been published in an earlier article,[2] so this account will concentrate upon developments since 1972.

Given its radical departures from previous standards for junior colleges, one might assume that there would be strong opposition to "Guidelines." An earlier statement of standards had indeed aroused strenuous opposition from a number of junior college administrators. Part of their protest was against the presumptuousness, as they then saw it, of recommendations about junior colleges being made by librarians or any group other than the chief administrators. Additionally, there was considerable disagreement with the minimum collection size of 20,000, a number that was then (1960) exceeded by very few junior colleges.

However, there was surprising acceptance of the document, considering the major change in philosophy—the integration of library and audiovisual services, the inclusion of production of these services, and the involvement of learning resources actively in instruction. Proof of the success of the document, and of the extent that two-year institutions had matured, is indicated by the very few adverse reactions. Some few individuals expressed disappointment about the lack of quantitative requirements or suggested minor changes in wording of specific criteria, but the "Guidelines" received general acceptance in the two-year institutions. The extensive hearings and the long period of development during which many problems had been resolved probably contrib-

uted significantly, as did the absence of more controversial quantitative criteria, but the continued acceptance contrasts with the shorter life span of the other academic standards.

In the introduction to "Guidelines," expectation was voiced that "these guidelines may serve as the foundations for research and for experimentation in organization, structure, and services."[3] In general, this has occurred. The many varying titles of the chief administrator involved and the divergent components of the learning resources programs support the latter expectation. The statement has also been utilized for research and other purposes.

One of the first individuals not directly involved in its development to write about "Guidelines" was Fritz Veit.[4] He used the statement throughout his book as he examined library services and learning resources provided in two-year colleges. He also noted endorsement of and use of the statement by state groups, especially in Illinois and Washington.

Other studies were conducted by Nieball, Berning, Thomson, Webb, and the team of Clark and Hirschman. Nieball found that a majority of the Texas institutions had utilized the qualitative statements by 1974, and that there was a high degree of correlation between the criteria and the actual practices and procedures. The only criteria where small numbers of Texas institutions were involved were those relating to network participation and formal cooperative arrangements with other libraries.[5]

Berning's study of public two-year colleges in Colorado found somewhat less correlation.[6] Criteria least often met related to nonprint facilities and equipment, adequacy of budgets, lack of trained staff, and absence of faculty rank. Colorado has not been among the states usually identified as being in the forefront of developments among two-year colleges; Berning's study reveals the transition from traditional library services to learning resources programs. Since this transition has occurred in the maturing of most two-year institutions, Berning's study could be the foundation for a later study on the impact of "Guidelines" in that state.

Thomson used a grant from the Council on Library Resources to survey services and budgets in a selected group of community colleges. Her study was not a study of the "Guidelines," but her observations and conclusions attest to their use and applicability.[7] Her study also highlights the diversity which is both a characteristic and a strength of two-year institutions, but which makes standards difficult to develop.

Webb, in a more recent study, had a group of ninety persons—almost equally divided among presidents, deans and administrators of

learning resources in Florida public colleges—rank the criteria in order of importance.[8] As could be anticipated, many of the individual criteria rated by respondents were ranked the full range, from important to insignificant. The differences in perception among the three groups was often revealing. Nearly two-thirds indicated the need for quantitative standards, but for quite different reasons. In general, "Guidelines" fared well, but it was interesting that presidents seemed to be more aware of the statement than deans.

Clark and Hirschman used "Guidelines" to study Ohio institutions.[9] They found that in one-third of the colleges, media and other learning resources were separated administratively, but that there was evidence of the leadership role of the statement on structure. They concluded that "Guidelines" was a useful tool, that it provided basic theory, and that it did furnish a set of objectives to be used as a basis for evaluation of performance by the colleges.

To a lesser degree, use of "Guidelines" has been made in other studies. Giles described the great significance of the statement in bridging the philosophical gap between the traditional print-related library services and services related to learning, instruction, and instructional systems. She found in the statement "enough flexibility to meet the special needs of individual institutions and to deal with whatever new media may emerge in the future."[10] Terwilliger found the statement to be in accord with the instructional role. The concepts contained provided the basis for "continuity to the entire educational program."[11] The impact of a strong learning resources program was illustrated with specific examples.

Three books also deserve mention. Allen and Allen completed their study[12] shortly after publication of "Guidelines." While their study was more comprehensive, dealing with management of many more specific items, their conclusions were harmonious with the criteria. Bender's more recent book[13] did study reaction to criteria statements, most of which were based on "Guidelines" directly, or were amplifications of it. He found widespread favorable reaction to the essential criteria. Over 81 percent of the institutions in his study had combined learning resources services, with only 7 percent retaining only print-related library services. Throughout his book there is evidence of the useful impact of "Guidelines" upon patterns of organization and services. That this influence reached beyond the two-year college can be found in a book by Burlingame, Fields and Schulzetenberg about learning resources centers in four-year institutions.[14] They make several references to the "Guidelines" and to the opinions and experiences of personnel in

two-year institutions, and many inferences about it as they discuss the organization and functions of such centers in senior colleges.

The role of "Guidelines" in the accreditation process has been discussed in several conferences.[15] The document has been recognized as appropriate to the self-study process that culminates in the regional accreditation of the institution. (Indeed, it would be unlikely that the accrediting associations, in their thrust for quality higher education, would ignore a basic statement emanating from three such major associations.) It is not, however, an accreditation document in the sense that an institution failing to meet or ignoring one or more of the criteria would automatically endanger its accreditation. The learning resources program is but one, although important, aspect of the accreditation of an entire institution. It is unreasonable to expect any regional accrediting association to use "Guidelines" directly in their evaluation of an institution, but its use in the self-study process would be acceptable to the accrediting associations.

Use has been made of "Guidelines" for statewide planning for community colleges. A typical example of this process is the state of Illinois. There the statement was supported implicitly, but quantitative standards for identification and meeting of statewide needs were developed to support the statement.[16] These quantitative standards dealt with collection size, staff, adequacy of physical facilities, and requirements for budgetary support.

State needs, as in Illinois, along with the recurring criticism of the lack of quantitative standards in "Guidelines," were not ignored by the Standards Committee and the ACRL Board, but difficulties in developing acceptable standards were also recognized. Probably the strongest evidence of the impact of the absence of some authoritative professional measurements was reflected in the assessment of library needs made for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS).[17] The consultants to NCLIS who were given the task of assessment, lacking any formulated standards, were forced to hypothesize numerical criteria for two-year colleges. A minimum collection, for example, was assumed to be 40,000 volumes, plus an additional number of print or audiovisual items for each full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty and student and for each field of study. With one-third of all two-year institutions having under 1000 FTE enrollments, and with such estimated measurements in collections and other areas, it is understandable that the study determined that there were significant deficiencies in almost every two-year institution. While deficiencies exist, to be sure, this was a case of measurement by the wrong scale. Although assess-

ments such as this are probably harmless, the time spent would have been more useful and appropriate had acceptable quantitative standards been available.

In spring 1975, the ACRL appointed an ad hoc subcommittee to attempt to develop quantitative standards for two-year colleges. William J. Hoffman was the first chairman; after several years he resigned and was replaced by James O. Wallace. The remainder of the subcommittee, including two representatives of AECT, remained the same until the subcommittee completed its assignment.

Hoffman has written about the problems faced by the subcommittee.[18] The major problem was the lack of a clear identification of the components of the learning resources program which were common to all two-year institutions. While library services were to be found in all of the colleges, the varieties of other units showed an amazing mixture of responsibilities. The best available study (by Peterson) had shown that, although some common components could be found, there were many discrete services across the country.[19] Making standards which were conditional upon the presence of a specific service was no solution.

Another apparent problem was the difference between development of standards objectively, in terms of needs for services; and development of criteria based upon a methodology which identified similar communities and related existing resources to those communities, and use of these to develop acceptable levels of resources. The final document, as later developed, was based on the latter procedure, because for all its obvious flaws, agreement was attainable.

The third problem faced by the subcommittee was the absence of appropriate national statistics. Information on existent holdings by two-year colleges of all types of materials—print and audiovisual—was essential to test the validity of any quantitative figures developed. Lack of such statistics had been one of the major reasons "Guidelines" did not include an appendix with quantitative criteria in 1972. Such statistics finally became available in 1977 when the National Center for Education Statistics published the 1975 library statistics gathered as part of the annual Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS).[20] In their 1975 survey, for the first time, detailed holdings of specific forms of print and audiovisual media were requested and received from the institutions surveyed. With these statistics available, it was possible to relate quantitative values to institutional conditions as the standards were developed.

After agonizing for several years over possible ways to meet its assignment, general agreement was reached by members of the subcommittee that every element in a learning resources program could not be

covered. Seven possible elements were finally identified; six are in the final document. Using the 1975 HEGIS figures, computer studies were made of the possible elements of staff and collection size by size of the student body based on FTE enrollments. One of the seven elements was resolved by citation to a comprehensive study of space needs[21] made in California; this was so well done that duplication was unnecessary. The subcommittee had only to prepare a table indicating correlation to FTE enrollment.

By 1978 the subcommittee had agreed on a preliminary draft, which was published in March 1979.[22] A few minor changes, including elimination of the attempt to develop user standards, were made before the final text was approved by the Committee on Standards and Accreditation and the ACRL Board on June 28, 1979.[23] The AECT Executive Board concurred at their fall meeting. The resultant document, *Statement on Quantitative Standards for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs*, was published separately by ACRL in 1979.

The *Statement* introduced several new concepts. One of these was the creation of five levels through which an institution could evaluate itself. This was done in the document by including in the tables "minimal" and "good" levels, which made possible a level representing less than "minimal," a level between the two, and a level above "good," which would "usually be found to have the capability of providing outstanding services."[24] Even though this action could be, and has been, challenged as an apparent conflict with the statement in the introduction to "Guidelines" "not to establish minimal (or accreditation) standards,"[25] the subcommittee did not consider the use of minimal levels for self-evaluation as being in conflict with the standards used in accreditation by a regional association. A collection below minimum professional standards would be a concern by an accrediting team during their visit, but the collection size should have been a concern of the institution long before the accreditation visit.

Another new concept not found in other academic library standards was the expectation that all resources on the entire campus would be considered in determining the size of the collection and other quantitative elements. Provision for obtaining materials through renting or borrowing, as in the case of motion pictures, was equally supportive to institutional needs, as was the spending of the same amounts to acquire infrequently used items. The size of the collection is expressed in bibliographical unit equivalents (BUE), a new term used to represent the concept that volumes or items alone did not sufficiently differentiate the impact of all types of materials. Five films rented or borrowed, for example, were equated to one item owned. Some audiovisual items

owned were also counted as a fraction of a unit: fifty individual slides (not in sets) were equated to one BUE, as were five microcards or five uncataloged microfiche.

An attempt was made by the subcommittee to devise a measurement for user services. The point made by Hoffman that standards should be based on services could not be followed, because there was no objective or quantitative method available for satisfactory measurement of all types of user services. In the published preliminary draft, a long and detailed list of possible user services statistics was included as an appendix. Ideally, the collection of such statistics nationally could make possible the development of quantitative standards developed from services provided. For the present this ideal was not possible; the list was deleted from the *Statement* as adopted.

The most comprehensive use of the *Statement* has been made by Carpenter.[26] Using the 1977 HEGIS data, he applied the quantitative standards in the draft document to the data available for two-year institutions. Not all the variables were adequately represented in the available statistics, particularly those on space and equipment. Some of the audiovisual media were grouped under "other recorded materials," and figures for motion pictures and videotapes were combined, but Carpenter was able to adjust most of the items to the available statistics. Carpenter's study included data from 1145 institutions. In size, 32 percent had fewer than 1000 FTE students; this finding included 82 percent of the private junior colleges, but only 19 percent of the publicly controlled institutions. Another one-third of the institutions had fewer than 3000 FTE students. At the other extreme, ten institutions had more than 9000 FTE students.

On reading the results of Carpenter's study for the first time, the number of institutions not meeting minimal levels seems excessive. Large numbers of institutions, particularly the smaller ones, were miserably below the minimum collection size. There was prevalent understaffing and inadequate financial support in many institutions. On the other hand, there are institutions which exceed the good level, institutions which would be recognized as excellent institutions on a majority, if not all, of the criteria.

The existence of either extreme among two-year colleges is no surprise. To have the quantitative standards met in advance by most institutions would raise even more questions about the validity of the measures suggested. The incentive value of quantitative standards must be recognized. In 1960, the first accepted quantitative standard for collection size (of 20,000 volumes) was formulated when an overwhelming two-thirds of the colleges did not reach that size. In Carpenter's

study, 80 percent of the institutions had in excess of 20,000 volumes. It remains for future studies to assess the changes in another decade.

One unstated obstacle to full reliance on Carpenter's study, aside from the lack of comprehensiveness in the available data, is the strong probability that the HEGIS report, directed as it was to college and university libraries, did not include full institutional statistics for many elements in a learning resources program. It will never be known how many units were omitted, how many staff were not counted because of organizational structure that placed personnel in a different component from libraries, and how many resources were overlooked. But it is certain that for many two-year institutions, only the library holdings, staff and finances were included. These are only part of a learning resources program for which the *Statement* was intended to measure. Recognizing such limitations does not negate the value of Carpenter's study; conditions in many institutions, however, may be better than the study indicates.

Subsequent to the publication of the draft, the subcommittee received communications from librarians and higher education officials in Colorado, British Columbia, Massachusetts, Alaska, Tennessee, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and in several other states, about use of the *Statement* in planning. Although it is too early to monitor all the applications as they occur, it is certain that the *Statement* is being used for self-assessment by individual institutions, as well.

Simultaneously with the work of the ad hoc subcommittee (which was guided by ACRL), the AECT agreed to provide the guidance for a review of "Guidelines." A task force was appointed under the chairmanship of Richard C. Decker for this purpose. Several individuals, including Decker, served on both the subcommittee and the task force, so there was constant communication. ACRL representatives served on the task force, as well. While there was no official representative from the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), staff of that association were kept informed of the work of both groups.

The task force reviewed "Guidelines" sentence by sentence. Changes to eliminate possible sexist language and to amplify certain criteria were suggested. The core of the document was found still to be germane. With some rearrangements and a few deletions, the task force recommended the changes to the three associations. A new definition of a two-year institution suggested by AACJC was incorporated to clarify that the document was designed for all types of two-year institutions.

The proposed revisions were considered by the ACRL Committee on Standards and Accreditation at the 1981 ALA conference in San Francisco, and were then accepted by the ACRL Board.[27] They had been

previously approved by AECT. The revised "Guidelines," along with the *Statement*, have recently been published.[28] With the revisions made in 1981, the standards for two-year colleges become the most recent, as well as the oldest, of the academic library standards.

References

1. American Library Association, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. "Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs." *College & Research Libraries News* 33(Dec. 1972):305-15. (Also appears in *Audiovisual Instruction* 18(Jan. 1973):50-61.)

2. Wallace, James O. "Two-Year College Library Standards." *Library Trends* 21(Oct. 1972):219-32.

3. ALA, et al., "Guidelines," p. 306.

4. Veit, Fritz. *The Community College Library*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1975.

5. Nieball, Mary L. "A Comparative Analysis of Library-Learning Resources Programs in the Public Junior Colleges of Texas." Ph.D. diss., Texas Woman's University, 1975.

6. Berning, Norbert J. "A Status Study of the Learning Resources Centers in the Public Community Colleges in the State of Colorado." Ed.D. diss., University of Northern Colorado, 1974.

7. Thomson, Sarah K. *Learning Resources Centers in Community Colleges: A Survey of Budgets and Services*. Chicago: ALA, 1975.

8. Webb, Mary A. "A Study of the Perceptions of the Presidents, Academic Deans and Learning Resources Administrators in the Public Community Colleges in Florida Regarding the 1972 Library Standards." Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, 1980.

9. Clark, Alice S., and Hirschman, Rita. "Using the 'Guidelines': A Study of the State-Supported Two-Year College Libraries in Ohio." *College & Research Libraries* 36(Sept. 1975):364-70.

10. Giles, Louise. "On the Cutting Edge of Change: The Community College Library/Learning Resources Center." In *New Dimensions for Academic Library Service*, edited by E.J. Josey, p. 56. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1975.

11. Terwilliger, Gloria. "The Learning Resource Center: What It is and How to Use It." *New Directions for Community Colleges* 5(Spring 1974):12.

12. Allen, Kenneth W., and Allen, Loren. *Organization and Administration of the Learning Resources Center in the Community College*. Hamden, Conn.: Linnet Books, 1973.

13. Bender, David R. *Learning Resources and the Instructional Program in Community Colleges*. Hamden, Conn.: Library Professional Publications, 1980.

14. Burlingame, Dwight, et al. *The College Learning Resource Center*. Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1978.

15. "A Conference on the New Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs: Implications for Southern Institutions." Andalusia, Ala.: Lurleen B. Wallace State Junior College Library, 1973; and *Libraries and Accreditation in Institutions of Higher Education*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1981.

16. Illinois Association of College and Research Libraries. "Quantitative Standards for Illinois Community College Learning Resource Centers." *Illinois Libraries* 59(Feb. 1977):115-19.

17. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. *National Inventory of Library Needs, 1975: Resources Needed for Public and Academic Libraries and Public School Library/Media Centers*. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1977.

18. Hoffman, William J. "The Development of Quantitative Standards for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs." *Catholic Library World* 48(Feb. 1977):276-79.

19. Peterson, Gary T. *The Learning Center: A Sphere for Nontraditional Approaches to Education*. Hamden, Conn.: Linnet Books, 1975.

20. National Center for Education Statistics. *Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, Fall 1975 Institutional Data*. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1977.

21. Learning Resources Association of the California Community Colleges. *Facilities Guidelines for Learning Resources Centers: Print, Non-Print, Related Instructional Services*. Suisun City, Calif.: 1978.

22. Ad Hoc Subcommittee to Develop Quantitative Standards for The "Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs." "Draft: Statement on Quantitative Standards for Two-Year Learning Resources Programs." *College & Research Libraries News* 40(March 1979):69-73.

23. "Highlights of the Annual Conference Meetings of the ACRL Board of Directors." *College & Research Libraries News* 40(Sept. 1979):236-37.

24. Association of College and Research Libraries. *Statement on Quantitative Standards for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs*. Chicago: ACRL, 1979, p. [1].

25. ALA, et al., "Guidelines," p. 306.

26. Carpenter, Raymond L. "Two-Year College Libraries: A Comparative Analysis in Terms of the ACRL Standards." *College & Research Libraries*, 42(Sept. 1981):407-15.

27. "Highlights of the Annual Conference Meetings of the ACRL Board of Directors." *College & Research Libraries News* 42(Sept. 1981):275-76.

28. American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. "Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs (Revised), Part I." *College & Research Libraries News* 43(Jan. 1982):5-10; and _____. "Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs (Revised), Part II." *College & Research Libraries News* 43(Feb. 1982):45-49.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

University Library Standards

BEVERLY P. LYNCH

THE FIRST STATEMENT on "Standards for University Libraries" in the United States was adopted in 1978 by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and in 1979 by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), a division of the American Library Association. The impetus to prepare the university library standards began in 1967 and came from university librarians who were impressed with the overall effect the 1959 "Standards for College Libraries" had in upgrading college libraries. In 1959 only a few libraries in the 1500 or so colleges in the United States could meet the minimums set forth in the standards. By 1970 these libraries had improved substantially in the very ways the standards proposed.

Although there was agreement on the apparent need for university library standards, there were difficulties in developing the standards. The difficulties stemmed from lack of agreement on the definition of "university" and disagreement over whether standards should be quantitative or qualitative. The statement finally adopted is qualitative in nature. It excludes quantitative standards, although it does recommend statistical methods useful for comparing one library with others.

Definition of Universities and Colleges

Preparation of the standards was aided by the publication in 1973 of *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education.*[1] Prepared by the

Beverly P. Lynch is University Librarian, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and based on 1970 data, the classification was revised in 1976.[2] The standards for university libraries are designed for those 184 institutions classified by the Carnegie Commission as Research Universities I (N = 51), Research Universities II (N = 47), Doctorate-Granting Universities I (N = 56), and Doctorate-Granting Universities II (N = 30). The Carnegie classification is based on the number of doctoral degrees awarded and the amount of total federal support of academic science generated over a period of several academic years. The Carnegie list includes a few institutions that did not quite meet the criteria, because of the high quality of their research and graduate training.

Between 1970 and 1976 a number of universities were added to the list and some changes occurred within categories, particularly within the doctorate-granting categories. The list of the fifty leading research universities composing the Research Universities I category was nearly unchanged. Three institutions were added to the category in 1976: Colorado State University, Oregon State University, and Boston University. Each of these had been classified as Research Universities II in the first edition. Three universities were excluded from the Research Universities I category in 1976: the University of Kentucky, Rutgers, and Vanderbilt University, each dropping into the Research Universities II category. Eight universities moved from the Doctorate-Granting Universities I category into the Research Universities II category. Sixteen moved into the Doctorate-Granting I category, and thirteen moved into the Doctorate-Granting Universities II category. Using the Carnegie Commission's classification, librarians can determine easily whether standards for university libraries should be applied to a particular library, or whether the standards for college libraries should apply.

Early Efforts

In 1967 ACRL undertook its first efforts to prepare university library standards. It called twenty people to a meeting in January of that year to discuss standards. These people represented university libraries, accrediting agencies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the Council on Library Resources (CLR). Later that year, ACRL appointed an ad hoc committee to consider possible standards. In November the CLR funded a two-day conference at Boston University. Twelve people attended, representing ACRL, ARL, CLR, The Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the U.S. Office of Education.[3]

The Boston conferees concluded that development of standards for university libraries was possible and desirable. They recommended that

ACRL and ARL appoint a joint committee to develop such standards. The conferees called attention to the differing organizational patterns of universities, and suggested that the joint committee give careful attention to the number and quality of academic majors, graduate programs, professional schools, and research institutions, along with consideration of the numbers of students, teaching faculty, research personnel, and other staff members. It was further recommended that the statement of standards include qualitative and quantitative criteria wherever possible in the following areas: functions of the library, staff, collections, facilities, budget, services, and cooperative programs. The conferees urged that available statistical data be analyzed to form the base on which quantitative standards would be developed.[4]

In 1968 the ARL/ACRL joint committee was appointed under the chairmanship of Robert B. Downs. Its members were Clifton Brock, Jr., Gustave A. Harrer, John W. Heussman, Jay K. Lucker, John P. McDonald, and Ellsworth G. Mason.

The Downs Committee

From the beginning, the Downs committee followed the suggestions emanating from the Boston conference. The committee's approach was to prepare a set of criteria for excellence for university libraries, basing the criteria on the best current practice. To determine best practice, the committee identified fifty leading university libraries in the United States and Canada and collected data from them on finances, resources, personnel, space, circulation, administration, and professional school libraries. Of these fifty universities selected by the committee in 1968, thirty-four were classified in the 1976 Carnegie list as Research Universities I, twelve as Research Universities II, two were classified as Doctorate-Granting Universities I, and two were Canadian universities.

The data were published in a paper, "Standards for University Libraries," prepared by Robert B. Downs and John W. Heussman.[5] The data are for 1967-68 and are aggregated. The average is reported, as are the median, the range, and the figures for the first and third quartiles. Using the data, a university library can be compared to the selected fifty in a number of areas. A library thus can be measured against a group of fifty peer institutions, or to an excellent group to which the particular library might aspire.

The relationship of total library expenditures to total university expenditures, is a matter of interest to many library administrators. Downs and Heussman reported that the library's percentage of expendi-

tures, compared to the university's general and educational expenditures, ranged from a low of 1.6 to a high of 8.6. The median was 3.6; and the average of the fifty leading institutions was 3.5.

The relationships of total library expenditures to salaries and wages, books, periodicals and bindings, and general expenses are other statistics found to be useful for comparative purposes. As reported in 1967-68, the percentage of total library expenditures for salaries and wages averaged 57.2 percent. The median was 56 percent. The range was 43.6-67.8 percent. Library expenditures for books, periodicals and bindings averaged 33.8 percent; the median was 36.5, and the range was 21.2-50 percent.

What is the appropriate size of the library's collection? Downs and Heussman reported the average for the fifty leading libraries to be 1,989,188 total volumes as of June 30, 1968. The median was 1,456,684 volumes, with a range of 890,000-7,920,387 volumes.

The committee continued its work. Having struggled with the definition of "university," it adopted the Carnegie classification as soon as it appeared in 1973. Late in 1974, the committee presented a preliminary report to ARL.[6] The committee proposed standards in the areas of resources, personnel, space, finances, public service, and administration. With regard to finances, for example, the committee stated:

> It should be noted that some university presidents object to a percentage standard for library budgets on the ground that there is great diversity of "institutional environments" and of "missions" among individual institutions.
>
> In realistic terms, one has to recognize that the university library's share of total funds is generally well under the old ACRL five percent figure and far below the Canadian utopia of ten percent....Among the 50 libraries reporting,...the average was 3.5 and the median 3.6 percent. The Joint Committee believes, nevertheless, that five percent standard is still reasonable as a minimum for the maintenance of high-quality libraries.[7]

The 5 percent recommendation was one of several departures the committee made from the norms emerging from the data collected from the fifty leading universities. The 1974 report also recommended that the standard for salaries and wages as a total of the library's budget should range between 60 and 65 percent; book, periodical and binding expenditures should range between 30 and 35 percent, and general expenses between 5 and 10 percent.

The committee recommended that the minimum size of the collection for those libraries in categories Research Universities I and II be 1.5 million. It recommended 1 million volumes for Doctorate-Granting

Universities I, and 750,000 for Doctorate-Granting Universities II. Its basic recommendation on collections was that the ARL/ACRL standard be the general Clapp-Jordan formula.[8]

The final report of the Downs Committee on University Library Standards was presented to the ARL membership at its May 1975 meeting.[9] The emphasis of the report was the same as the committee's preliminary report. Specific, concrete criteria were presented as standards. The committee had added an introductory statement on the "Significance of University Libraries" and a section on library cooperation. It had removed the fixed formula for staffing, noting that libraries are in a period of transition, and that fixed formulas would be of doubtful validity from a long-range point of view. The committee did not believe its report to be suitable for adoption as a code of standards. Rather, it expected the ARL and ACRL to appoint a subsequent committee to formulate a code of standards based upon its report.[10]

The Smith Committee

Later in 1975, a new joint committee was appointed with Eldred Smith as chair. The original members were Calvin Boyer, William Kurth, Stanley McElderry, Richard Talbot, Melvin Voigt, and David R. Watkins. Upon the retirement of Voigt and the death of Kurth, Beverly Lynch was appointed to the committee. The committee's work was assisted by a J. Morris Jones/ALA Goals Award and by the Council on Library Resources, which supported a meeting in 1977 of the committee members with representatives of the regional accrediting associations and various higher education groups.

The committee moved quickly to review the work of the Downs committee and to determine the areas in which it would propose standards. In order to make a more informed judgment about the utility or desirability of quantitative standards, the committee gathered data from libraries in the four Carnegie Commission categories. It tested three approaches to quantitative formulas: (1) the Washington State Formula as proposed in the 1974 preliminary report of the Downs committee,[11] (2) the collection development formula proposed by Melvin Voigt,[12] and (3) the regression formulas developed by Baumol and Marcus.[13] Based upon the results of its tests, the committee concluded that neither the Washington State nor Voigt formulas could be used to produce national quantitative standards for university libraries. The results were too variable to be useful guides *for* practice across the total spectrum of university libraries.

In making its assessment, the committee assumed that if the formulas were to be useful, the ratios of actual value to value predicted by the formula should be within 20 percent of unity, and the individual ratios for most of the institutions in any category should be within ±20 percent of unity. In nearly every case, the Washington State and Voigt formulas failed one or both of these tests. For public services and technical services staff in U.S. libraries, for example, the formulas greatly overpredicted the number of staff required. For periodicals, the formulas consistently underpredicted the number of periodicals in university libraries. This was especially true for the largest private university libraries.

The regression analyses based upon the work of Baumol and Marcus offered a more promising approach. The analyses depend upon grouping similar institutions into separate categories and having readily available data for comparative purposes. The analysis does not yield a standard; it does enable institutions to be compared systematically with others. Data are available for those libraries that are members of the Association of Research Libraries. Since the adoption of the standards, ACRL has begun to collect and report data for those university libraries not members of ARL.

The survey by the committee also sought comments about standards from librarians. The results were as expected. Librarians in the larger, wealthier institutions—especially the private ones—were opposed to quantitative standards. The librarians in these institutions believed that standards would be based upon minimum levels far below what had been achieved already by their libraries. Libraries in smaller, less wealthy, chiefly public institutions were more supportive of quantitative standards developed within the profession.

The dilemma posed to the committee by the predictable division of opinion led to the abandonment of the notion of quantitative standards. The committee, in proposing the use of regression analysis, recognized that even within the more precise Carnegie Commission categories, the potential for comparing institutions at either end of the spectrum would lead to invalid comparisons. The committee therefore recommended the acceptance of common techniques rather than quantitative standards. It urged the profession to develop quantitative measures that would lead to useful institutional comparisons, rather than to develop quantitative national standards that at best would be ignored, and at worst, rejected.

Standards applied to university and college libraries in the United States are developed voluntarily. Once adopted officially by the profes-

sional associations, librarians seek to persuade administrators, budget officers, various accrediting agencies, and other agencies of the usefulness of standards for evaluative purposes. The process is a deliberate one. It moves in what appears to be a very leisurely fashion. In the case of the development of university library standards, the process took twelve years.

The Standards

The statement on university library standards that was subsequently adopted offers no quantities.[14] A substantive change from other statements also is reflected in the first standard. It refers to services, not to collections. In recent years the university library community in the United States has been interested more in services than it has been in collections. The standards reflect that shift in interest.

Six elements have been the most common to academic library standards: (1) the size of book stock or collections, (2) the size and composition of staff in terms of numbers of professional librarians, (3) the percentage of the institution's total budget to be used to determine the library's budget, (4) the seating capacity of the library (usually written in terms of the percentage of the student body which can sit down in the library at any given time), (5) the library's services, and (6) the library's administration. All standards for academic libraries emphasize the primary objective of the library—to support the instructional and research programs of the institution of which the library is a part. The six elements and the primary objective of the library are discussed in the standards for university libraries: "These standards are not intended to establish normative prescriptions for uniform application. Rather, they are meant to provide a general framework within which informed judgment can be applied to individual circumstances."[15]

The standards are a series of principles stated succinctly, and amplified in a commentary that follows. The three standards relating to collections are:

> (B.1) A university library's collections shall be of sufficient size and scope to support the university's total instructional needs and to facilitate the university's research programs.
> (B.2) A university library's collections shall be developed systematically and consistently within the terms of explicit and detailed policies.
> (B.3) A university library's collections shall contain all of the varied forms of recorded information.[16]

Quantitative measures are mentioned in the commentary on principle B.1:

> ...formulas...can yield only approximations which indicate a general level of need. If they are applied arbitrarily and mechanically, they can distort the realities of a given situation. Nevertheless, quantitative measures are increasingly important in guiding the qualitative judgement that must ultimately be applied to university libraries and their collections.[17]

The statement on "Standards for University Libraries" does not avoid quantities altogether. The statement offers some guidance to those who are asked to make informed judgments about university libraries and the support those libraries provide to the instruction, research and service programs of the universities. "One technique is the use of regression analysis to facilitate the comparison of similar libraries to one another; another of some general applicability is the 'index of quality' developed by the American Council on Education for relating library collection size to graduate program quality."[18]

The Usefulness of the Standards

How useful are the "Standards for University Libraries"? Are they effective? To answer these questions, the directors of the libraries of the 184 institutions listed in the 1976 Carnegie Commission classification were queried by mail in October 1981. The questionnaire was based on one developed by Larry Hardesty and Stella Bentley for their survey on "The Use and Effectiveness of the 1975 'Standards for College Libraries.' "[19] A total of eighty-eight questionnaires were returned in time for inclusion in this paper—a response rate of 48 percent. No follow-up letters or reminders were sent. The responses under-represent the Doctorate-Granting II institutions. Only nine of a possible thirty questionnaires were returned from that group—a 30 percent response rate. Thirty of a possible fifty-one were returned from the Research Universities I group (59 percent), twenty of forty-seven were returned by the Research Universities II group (43 percent), and twenty-nine of fifty-six were returned from the Doctorate-Granting Universities I group (52 percent).

Of the eighty-eight responses, eighty-two indicated they were familiar, very familiar, or thoroughly familiar with the standards. The two responses indicating no familiarity were from librarians in the Research Universities I category, representing the very largest of the public and private research libraries.

The respondents were asked how they used the standards. Forty-seven (54 percent) indicated they had not used the standards at all. Twenty of these were from Research Universities I institutions; twelve from Doctorate-Granting Universities I. Other respondents indicated they used the standards to justify budgets, to justify improvements in the physical plant, and to upgrade collections. Less use was made of the standards to justify the expansion of staff, the improvement of services or the maintenance of the status quo. Some respondents said they used the statement for accreditation purposes, either as background for members of their faculties and administration who are seving on accrediting teams, or for their own use on accrediting teams.

For each of the sixteen standards, the respondents were asked their opinions as to whether the standard was very useful, moderately useful, somewhat useful, not very useful, or not useful at all. Table 1 reports the opinions of the directors. Over one-third of the respondents found six of the standards to be not very useful or not useful at all: standards A.1, B.1 and B.3, D.1 and D.2, and F.1. Over 40 percent found standards B.1, B.3, D.1 and F.1 to be not very useful or not at all useful.

It was expected that the responses from librarians in the largest research libraries would be significantly different from the others. These libraries represent the oldest and largest libraries. Standards for evaluation purposes often are claimed to be less useful to these libraries than to libraries in younger, emerging universities. A simple chi-square test was performed on the six standards found to be not very useful by at least one-third of the respondents, to determine whether the responses of the directors of libraries in Research Universities I institutions differed significantly from those of librarians in the other categories. A significant difference (at the .05 level) was found in two instances, in standards B.3 (relating to varied forms of recorded information) and F.1 (relating to sufficient budgetary support).

The standards receiving general support as to their usefulness are those for which quantities would not be expected: A.2 (national bibliographical standards should apply to the records of library collections); E.1,2,3, and 4 (pertaining to the policies and practices of the administration and governance of university libraries); and F.2 (the library's budget should be managed by the chief administrative officer of the library). The disagreements continue on the fundamental issue—whether or not standards for university libraries should be quantitative.

The standards for university libraries are applied to a diverse group of libraries. A majority of the directors of these libraries do not find the standards to be very useful. By contrast, the majority of directors of

TABLE 1

University Library Directors' Opinions on the Usefulness of Standards for University Libraries

Standard	*Very useful*	*Moderately useful*	*Somewhat useful*	*Not very useful*	*Not at all useful*	*Total Number of respondents*
SECTION A Services						
A.1 Promote use	14 (16.6%)	13 (15.4%)	24 (28.6%)	23 (27.3%)	10 (11.9%)	84
A.2 Conform to national standards	20 (23.5%)	23 (27.0%)	24 (28.2%)	12 (14.1%)	6 (7.1%)	85
A.3 Provide access	13 (15.3%)	21 (24.7%)	24 (28.2%)	20 (23.5%)	7 (8.2%)	85
SECTION B Collections						
B.1 Sufficient size	23 (27.1%)	10 (11.8%)	14 (16.5%)	27 (31.8%)	11 (13.0%)	85
B.2 Develop systematically	15 (17.6%)	18 (21.2%)	24 (28.2%)	22 (25.9%)	6 (7.1%)	85
B.3 Varied formats	8 (9.3%)	13 (15.1%)	21 (24.4%)	26 (30.2%)	18 (20.9%)	86
SECTION C Personnel						
C.1 Sufficient number	12 (14.5%)	14 (16.9%)	27 (32.5%)	21 (25.3%)	9 (10.8%)	83
C.2 Sound practice	13 (15.3%)	17 (20.0%)	28 (32.9%)	21 (24.7%)	6 (7.1%)	85

TABLE 1—*Continued*

Standard	*Very useful*	*Moderately useful*	*Somewhat useful*	*Not very useful*	*Not at all useful*	*Total Number of respondents*
SECTION D Facilities						
D.1 Meet requirements	13 (15.3%)	12 (14.1%)	24 (28.2%)	25 (29.4%)	11 (12.9%)	85
D.2 Convenient	11 (12.9%)	12 (14.1%)	22 (25.8%)	29 (34.1%)	11 (12.9%)	85
SECTION E Administration						
E.1 Structure identified	22 (25.8%)	29 (34.1%)	21 (24.7%)	7 (8.2%)	6 (7.1%)	85
E.2 Clearly specified	18 (21.1%)	22 (25.8%)	25 (29.4%)	14 (16.5%)	6 (7.1%)	85
E.3 Libraries related	20 (23.8%)	21 (25.0%)	21 (25.0%)	16 (19.0%)	6 (7.1%)	84
E.4 Policies defined	19 (22.6%)	21 (25.0%)	26 (31.0%)	14 (16.6%)	4 (4.7%)	84
SECTION F Finances						
F.1 Sufficient support	13 (15.3%)	15 (17.6%)	21 (24.7%)	22 (25.8%)	14 (16.5%)	85
F.2 Managed by librarian	22 (26.2%)	20 (23.8%)	18 (21.4%)	17 (20.2%)	7 (8.3%)	84

college libraries, surveyed by Hardesty and Bentley, found *all* of the college library standards to be useful.[20]

The university library directors were asked whether the standards should be revised. Table 2 indicates the responses to the question. Many of those supporting revision want more specificity and quantifiable minimum criteria. Those opposed to revision believe that the statement is the best the profession can achieve. Those who believe minimum quantities would be useful said so:

> We find truly that the "Standards" are useless in making arguments to our administration or to governing bodies in the State. What these administrators want is data and quantitative comparisons; and for this we turn not to the "Standards," but to whatever we can draw out of the *ARL Statistics* (or the *ACRL Statistics*).

> The Standards are somewhere between guidelines and suggestions. I don't see how they set any sort of a *standard* against which anything can be measured. They are concepts—they are wise advice—but they are so general that they can hardly be used to tell whether a library in fact is doing anything.

Some respondents said that developing and including measures of library effectiveness would be an improvement.

TABLE 2
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY DIRECTORS' OPINIONS ON WHETHER STANDARDS SHOULD BE REVISED

Opinion	*Research Universities I*	*Research Universities II*	*Doctorate-Granting Universities I*	*Doctorate-Granting Universities II*	*Total*
Yes	7	8	18	5	38
No	10	6	5	2	23
Undecided	10	6	5	2	23
Total	27	20	28	9	84

Many commented that it would be very difficult, if not futile, to revise the standards in order to reflect greater specificity or quantitative statements.

> The standards are a realistic reflection of the fact that you cannot quantify university libraries—nice as that would be. Universities sometimes fit into "types" and sometimes are very unique. The library, to be effective, must reflect the university's goals and mission. These goals and missions vary widely from institution to institution.

> A case can be made that "noble" goals are, in the long run, more valuable than many might think. Liberty, Justice, Honor are certainly vague enough, yet millions died for their interpretations thereof. On balance, perhaps one should leave well enough alone.

A number of supporters of university library standards indicated that it is difficult to achieve a broadly based consensus among the university librarians. While supportive of the standards, they were not supportive of revision:

> A number of years of experience persuade me that truly useful standards for university libraries could be written but could not win unanimous approval. The larger private university libraries will continue to oppose quantitative standards or standards which begin to apply uniform measurements to measurable factors. The variety and complexity of university libraries and the number of variables involved make the writing of meaningful standards a difficult, time-consuming and costly task, one that I fear may not be worth the effort, especially if the standards cannot be ratified.
>
> I have found very little support for the application and use of standards at large research libraries. I do not support the establishment of quantitative criteria and therefore see little value in "playing around" with the present language. I feel that compilations of data like the ARL statistics and the ACRL statistics are potentially more useful.
>
> Rather than trying to "improve" the standards directly, I would advocate the development of model procedures and practices such as model budgetary procedures, performance measures, collection policies. In addition, the research library community should publish "suitable ratios" annually as business firms do.
>
> Standards are, by their nature, a compromise. This is particularly true in instances such as the university library standards where they must cover a rather broad spectrum of institutional difference and variety. Under these circumstances it is important to recognize what a particular set of standards can and cannot be expected to accomplish. In the case of the university library standards, I believe that they can be of general help and support but that they cannot be of specific assistance in most cases. Quantification might improve support for part of the constituent group, but it would also jeopardize another part. For example, specific collection size formulas might help some of the weaker libraries and might damage some of the stronger ones. Specific ratios between professional and nonprofessional staff might help to upgrade certain situations, but might unduly constrain others. With regard to university library standards, it is better to stick to broad, qualitative principles rather than attempt to quantify. I believe this results in standards which can be generally supportive over all, but which are of relatively little use with regard to specific issues. This is the best we can accomplish with regard to standards.

Summary

The preparation and adoption of the "Standards for University Libraries" was a major accomplishment and an important achievement. The task was long and arduous, but the importance of it was never in question. University librarians in the United States had agreed that it was incumbent upon the library profession to develop such standards lest the task be assumed by others or the "Standards for College Libraries" be inappropriately applied. The joint efforts of the Association of Research Libraries and the Association of College and Research Libraries, a division of the American Library Association, resulted in inevitable compromises in order to gain the necessary consensus. For some the compromises were necessary and appropriate. For others the compromises were too severe.

Standards for libraries generally are used for purposes of evaluation. Thus, the task of designing a set of standards becomes the task of designing an instrument of evaluation. Standards also are designed to establish goals of excellence to be applied realistically by others. The "Standards for University Libraries" (finally adopted after twelve years of effort) provide a framework, or an outline, for evaluation. The standards provide no bench marks. So the standards are much less useful as a tool for evaluation than are the standards developed for other types of academic libraries.

University librarians know the standards. Some have used them. Many have been guided by them. Despite the criticism, only thirty-eight directors responding to a questionnaire support revision. Twenty-three oppose revision, and twenty-three remain ambivalent. Widespread support for revision of the 1979 "Standards for University Libraries" is not yet evident.

References

1. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education.* Berkeley, Calif.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1973.

2. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education,* rev. ed. Berkeley, Calif.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1976.

3. Watkins, David R. "Standards for University Libraries." *Library Trends* 21(Oct. 1972):190-203.

4. Council on Library Resources. "Minutes of a Meeting to Explore the Feasibility of University Library Standards" (2-3 Nov. 1967, Boston University Library). Mimeographed.

5. Downs, Robert B., and Heussman, John W. "Standards for University Libraries." *College & Research Libraries* 31(Jan. 1970):28-35.

6. Downs, Robert B., chm. "Report of the ARL/ACRL Task Force on University Library Standards." In *Minutes of the Eighty-Fifth Meeting, January 18, 1975, Chicago*, pp. 100-15. Washington, D.C.: ARL, 1975.

7. Ibid., p. 112.

8. Ibid., p. 103.

9. ———— . "Report of the ARL/ACRL Committee on University Library Standards." In *Minutes of the Eighty-Sixth Meeting, May 8-9, 1975, Houston, Tex.*, App. B, pp. 95-113. Washington, D.C.: ARL, 1975.

10. Ibid., p. 40.

11. Office of Interinstitutional Business Studies. "A Model System for Program 05 Libraries." Seattle: University of Washington, 1968.

12. Voigt, Melvin J. "Acquisition Rates in University Libraries." *College & Research Libraries* 36(July 1975):263-71.

13. Baumol, William J., and Marcus, Matityahu. *Economics of Academic Libraries*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973.

14. "Standards for University Libraries." *College & Research Libraries News* 40(April 1979):101-10.

15. Ibid., p. 101.

16. Ibid., pp. 102-03.

17. Ibid., p. 103.

18. Ibid.

19. Hardesty, Larry, and Bentley, Stella. "The Use of Effectiveness of the 1975 Standards for College Libraries': A Survey of College Library Directors" (paper presented at the 1981 National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries, 1-4 Oct. 1981, Minneapolis, Minn.). Mimeographed.

20. Ibid.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

School Media Standards

JANE ANNE HANNIGAN

THE CHILD IS THE CENTER of the schooling process. All of the resources, services and programs offered by the school media center must, therefore, be designed to facilitate the child's growth as an aware, productive and fulfilled human being. New opportunities for human development, encouraged and supported by modern technological environments, should be provided to capitalize upon the child's encounter with all forms of information in order to accomplish this goal. Thus, one must begin any consideration of school media center standards with the realization that the real purpose for the development and promulgation of such standards is to assure the richest potential for the child's encounter with information and ideas. Undoubtedly, the visionary approach, combined with the specific set of directives common in these standards, has provided practicing media specialists with appropriate sets of guides for such quality services.

Education has changed rather radically over the past several decades. At the turn of the century and throughout the early 1900s, there seemed to be much more uniformity in educational practice, reflecting what were then generally accepted national ideals.[1] From about the fifties on, however, there has been an even more rapid acceptance of diversity in educational practice. What had been an attempt to conform all education to one mold became an allegiance to alternatives in educational approaches.[2] The school library standards were a bit slow in incorporating this process of development, but the 1975 *Media Pro-*

Jane Anne Hannigan is Professor, School of Library Service, Columbia University, New York.

grams: District and School came closest to matching this philosophy of schooling.[3] The flexibility inherent in this document recognized—although perhaps implicitly rather than explicitly—the need for an individual school district to evaluate the nature and extent of its particular program of media services and the resources required for the successful implementation of improved service to media center users. The guides given were simply measures of known quality throughout this country. This document is perhaps the first instance among all standards of a forced interaction in which users of the document are expected to determine priorities and make decisions about the management and operation of their programs in light of these priorities.

The debate about the lack of a research base for the standards is an interesting one, but not as significant as many authors would like us to believe.[4] Repeatedly, the school library standards committees have, in some measure, used research findings—most often a combination of survey data and results of interviews with experts in both practice and theory. Neither of these approaches is invalid in research, although I would not make the claim that they are among the most tightly controlled research designs. To dismiss all of this research over the years, however, is neither a fair nor an accurate assessment. What is important to recognize is that much of the research was concerned with the state of the art in practice, the collecting (for the most part) of nominal data which reflected the nature and extent of services. It is obviously easier to collect facts on sizes of budgets, collections, facilities, and personnel; it is much harder to collect data that reveal useful statistics about programs and the achievement of targeted objectives, but this difficult task must not be buried under the accumulated statistics of that which is more easily documented. In this respect, the school media field is uniquely susceptible to error in that it is a part of a larger configuration—the school. The variables are not easily controlled nor are they isolated for study.

Any examination of the documents that have been labeled as standards in the school media field will reveal that they are not "standards" by most accepted definitions.[5] Authors of these documents have used the word *standards* over time for various reasons, the most likely of which was the need to establish credibility and authority in professional practice. Many accepted the term *standards* without any understanding that certain criteria must be present if indeed that term was to be used legitimately and appropriately. The term *guidelines* was considered by many to be weaker, denoting a lesser quality; and therefore, professional leaders who had developed sets of documents simply determined that the terminology to be adopted would make use of the word *standards*.

Despite this, the history of the documents in the school media field demonstrates that they have functioned over time as catalysts for various types of activities in schooling.

It is important to recognize that standards for many years have been a combination of both descriptive and prescriptive information. In all instances there has been evidence of some degree of realism in terms of current practice, although obviously this is reflective of "best practice," rather than what is to be found in the "average" setting. In spite of the fact that the standards have never been legally mandated, and thus enforceable, they have served as a means of evaluation and judgment of educational excellence for many decades. Accreditation agencies do at least make use of the standards for comparison purposes. The School Library Media Program of the Year Award is based in part on conformity to the standards, and there is ample evidence that various states in this country have used the standards as a means for determination of excellence, and often for special funding, as well as for the development of their own sets of state standards.[6] The funding of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) sites reveals that the standards were a part of the assessment and evaluative process. There is no question that they have been used by various schooling agencies or individual library media specialists in helping to gain support for improving services and programs.

One problem that is significant in the examination of the current *Media Programs: District and School* is the terminology used within the document.[7] Since 1975, many professionals, and indeed the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) itself, have returned to the terms *school librarian* or *school library media specialist.* I suspect this is linked to an attitude of survival, rather than to a logical analysis or philosophical decision. In other words, many persons became conscious of cutbacks and layoffs, and determined that, to keep their jobs, they would have to return to a job title that made clear to the public the role they performed in the school. As a result, what had taken years of negotiation to accomplish was wiped out by the board of AASL without consultation with the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) or the membership at large.[8] Despite the fact that the "standards"—as they are called—was an official document of the two associations, the unilateral action of one association disavowed the language already accepted and adopted as official policy of both associations. It is pointless to argue the merits of these decisions: what is important to acknowledge is that a communication process should have occurred. The association was undoubtedly anxious to preserve the rights and futures of its members. To do so at the sacrifice of communi-

cation and accord with the companion organization seems both irresponsible and inappropriate. What we are called is less important than the need to pull together to achieve the best possible professional climate for members and, ultimately, the best quality education for children and youth.

There appears to be general agreement that *Media Programs: District and School* is no longer in tune with the educational times.[9] The professional community is uneasy with it, and recognizes the need to address a revision. Should AASL go it alone? This is a question that might be answered by suggesting that, of course, we could do so and be more efficient in the use of our person-power. It might be noted, however, that school library or media center standards have historically been produced collaboratively with AECT, and probably the two bodies should continue to work in tandem to improve opportunities for children in schools. The challenges to this continued cooperation may not be reflective of our best professional judgment. A survey currently being conducted by the AASL Standards Implementation Committee neither addresses research data collection, nor does it ask fundamental questions that might lead to more objective decisions about revisions.[10] Even more important, however, is the fact that this survey was undertaken with no involvement by AECT.

One point that has always been considered very important by AASL, and (to some degree, at least) by AECT, was the recognition and ratification of the standards by the various educational groups named on the title page of the 1960 standards.[11] It has been thought that the support of such groups as the International Reading Association (IRA), the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), and the Public Library Association (PLA) would add immeasurably to the influence of the document in schooling. The cost of this approach in terms of a dollar amount, as well as time, may be in excess of the benefits. There is no hard evidence that the support of such groups, or the placement of their names in any document, enhances its chances of acceptance or implementation. It might be more useful to seek input from the agencies that have a more immediate impact on media services, such as groups in computer technology and network interfaces, as well as groups within ALA working on standards for special users such as the handicapped and the deaf.

Although I have suggested that research has been and should continue to be a part of the history of the standards, it is true that the level of sophistication of such research is rather low. The approach to the development of standards should be twofold: the professional com-

munity at the national level should set general guidelines and directions for the profession that have a form of authority, while, at the same time, including quantitative figures for those aspects of services that reflect measurable activities. The day in which the standards should suggest uniformity is long past.[12] Whenever possible, the developers of documents to be used or considered as standards should make use of any opportunities for research information, particularly now that national statistics are less easily available because of cuts in the U.S. Department of Education. The involvement of state agencies in obtaining data is critical, and should be encouraged to the fullest. What is of importance is recognition that the gathering of statistics must be related to the information needed.[13]

Media Programs: District and School might best be approached for revisions by first identifying those overriding principles that will necessarily affect any decisions we will make. The first principal I would identify is that of personal freedom. My understanding of personal freedom includes a recognition of our responsibility to analyze and evaluate the message content of various technologies, such as book, film, newspaper, game, disc, photograph, toy, or computer software, and to help young people develop a similar competence. Additionally, my concern for personal freedom includes addressing the problems of piracy, information packaging and the invasion of privacy. Certainly, computer technology enables one either to enhance or to limit personal freedom, and the profession needs to consider the ramifications of such possibilities. The second principle of overwhelming importance is that, in this age of information overload, human beings must still be recognized and respected as the orchestrators and controllers of that information. The availability of information to the consumer is readily recognizable, but the means of negotiation through the enormous amount of information is more difficult to discern. These two principles come together in a consideration of how we teach students to sort out the discursive and nondiscursive meanings they encounter.

The standards have for years skirted the issue of teaching, and have never offered sufficient information or direction on this topic.[14] We have not sought to locate appropriate information on teaching from educational practice, nor have we sought to identify the specific areas of competence to be considered the territory of the school media specialist. Nowhere has the profession determined the scope and sequence of our responsibilities to students and to the schooling process. We have continued to suggest that learning the location and use of simple materials or library skills is our goal, forgetting that finding or obtaining access to information is only a relatively small and, to some extent, an insignifi-

cant part of the need of an individual learner confronted with information. Have we examined whether our teaching responsibilities include subject disciplines? Should media specialists be expected to acquire competencies in teaching strategies? If so, what competencies can be identified, and how is this competence to be acquired? To what extent are we to be responsible for the teaching of children's literature and media?[15] When and how should our teaching be influenced and altered by various groups of students, including those with mental, linguistic and/or physical handicaps? Vandergrift has identified a key facet of the media specialist's responsibility:

> We need to develop the kind of sensitivity to students, teachers, and issues associated with technology that will enable us to ask appropriate teaching questions in a technological environment....In many situations in teaching, the critical content is not the logical, linear, factual presentation of an event or subject matter but humane judgments about the way it affected persons and society.[16]

There are a number of tools that may aid in our understanding and increase our capacity to address this aspect of the changes needed in the development of standards. It may be useful to design instruments to identify and measure the degree of teaching competence now exercised by media specialists. The resulting data should inform any recommendations that might be made. Again, one must keep in mind that diversity, rather than uniformity, is sought.

The increased availability and capability of small personal computers, along with a concern for individual learning styles, introduces the possibility of greater interactive personal instruction provided by the computer.[17] This is one of the most remarkable factors I see in the coming years, but can the computer replace the teacher and the school media specialist? For some aspects of information-processing, I believe that this is possible, but human facilitators will continue to be essential to encourage and enhance social interaction and metaphorical learning. Perhaps it is true that students of the future will learn in a computerized environment, either at home or in a place called "school," but there will continue to be agents of learning to help them find their ways through the electronic maze, just as there will be those persons who will be creative in the process of developing programming for the computers.[18] These persons will probably continue to be called "teachers," or perhaps "school media specialists."

Computer architecture will require thoughtful consideration of the needs in schooling and the changes in the capability of computers. It is indeed probable that computer use in schools will increase at such a

rapid rate that we will soon not have any school without computer technology. This will obviously have an impact on the standards in terms of specifications for both hardware and software, and in terms of the required competencies needed by the professionals who will work with students and teachers as they encounter the complexity of this electronic equipment. We will need to determine the degree of programming competence and computer language skill that must be acquired, as well as the ability to evaluate and select materials for the computer.[19] Such competencies will naturally form a part of the standards in any contemplated revisions. Allied to this are the resultant configuration of computers that will communicate with one another for purposes of greater efficiency of media center operations, and also permit a vast array of resources to be identified and used by the individual. The need for, and use of, data bases in schooling is only at the beginning stages. Some consideration will have to be given to OCLC or other network utilities that permit efficient results in terms of the products offered. There also may be some danger in the concentration on functional aspects of the computer environment, and not on the service aspects for the clientele of the media center. The computer environment will probably require some additional education of the professionals in school media centers in order to provide various levels of service to users. We will need to identify the capacity of each computer in a large and complex architectural configuration. We will need to ask and to answer such questions as: Which tasks are most appropriate for one type of processer rather than another? Is cost-effectiveness the criteria for acceptance or rejection of specific computer configurations? What appears to be the most cost-effective approach to linking one or more of these computers needs to be considered also in terms of the human cost of such decisions. No action which alienates or inconveniences users can, in the long run, be cost-effective.

The school media specialist will have to face an increase in electronic publishing and determine how the user of informational and imaginative content will cope.[20] We have developed some interesting approaches to criticism of literature and film, but we have not begun to determine the criticism necessary for assessing the computer software that is now published and will undoubtedly escalate. The standards will have to deal with this question in a more realistic fashion than have our earlier attempts to cope with technology, as witnessed by the failure to deal effectively with film.

A related area of concern in revising the standards is that of telecommunications and cable growth. Fiber optics have made possible a lowering of costs in dealing with communication. Interactive systems, such as

the experiment with Qube allowing viewers to make simple responses to information by manipulating dials or buttons on their home television screens, will undoubtedly increase. What seems to be the relevant question for the school media specialist is best expressed in the following: Will such interactive systems be accepted passively by the user, or will we in schooling educate young people to interact in creative fashions and to exercise some control over the content of these systems? For instance, might an interactive system be used in the near future to give citizens more direct access to their political representatives, allowing citizens to introduce their own concerns into the system as well as to respond to predetermined content?

The standards should probably address the career development of professionals, including the process of continuing education. Standards have ignored the educational specifications or requirements of the school media specialist other than outlining the specific functions that person should perform. Perhaps it is time to link these identified skills and competencies to specific patterns of career development and educational levels. It may be appropriate for the specialization question to be addressed in such a document, as well as an analysis of the interrelationships among professionals, paraprofessionals, technical, clerical, and even volunteer workers in school media centers. The personnel segment needs a great deal of intense study to determine possible alternative career plans and ladders that might be suggested in the standards. Personnel is a critical area in any revision of the document, but consideration of this topic must be based on sound evidence.

The varieties and interrelationships of certification laws, and the needs of the school media specialist for continuing education to meet licensing requirements should be addressed. Continuing education should also be considered in relation to technological innovations, such as the computer, and to possible areas of emphasis or specialization by professions. School media specialists have always been anxious to develop relationships with children and youth through literature and film or through curriculum projects. They may be less and less interested in managerial tasks. Most will accept that it is necessary to operate a well-managed center, and seek to do so, but more and more professionals are looking to greater interaction with students and teachers as the primary emphasis of their work (perhaps as a reaction to the stress on technical and managerial skills of the past decade). Even in the use of the newest technologies, such as the personal computer, many media specialists are concentrating on this technology as a means to facilitate interaction with young people and attempting to make everyday

managerial tasks a part of the machine load so that more time is freed for direct involvement with learners. At the same time, there are those professionals who carefully study the technology itself and consider their role to be that of engineers of the system. Again, diversity is of the greatest importance, and the personnel section of the standards might provide a genuine service with a consideration of alternative paths to career development within the school.

The role of unions and other bargaining agencies is clearly something that has been consistently neglected in school media standards. Although there are some ramifications of this question that must be examined in order to avoid legal jeopardy for any of the associations, this does not obviate the responsibility to examine the issues. Perhaps references to helpful resources on bargaining or factual statements on rights should be included. For example, grievance procedures are neither understood nor used in the best fashion by most school media specialists, whose job responsibilities have been altered radically with arbitrary decisions by a school administrator.

It is inevitable that the merging of the school-building and district-level operations in the same document will present some additional problems. Standards might be separated into two distinct documents in order to best tackle this situation. For the time being, the current approach of placing them within the same document is a viable compromise. Any revisions group should examine this question carefully. More and more networking modes require cooperation at the district level, as well as at the state or regional level, rather than at the building level. It is also true that a great deal of information about district operations and decision-making is necessary for informed decisions at the building level. In spite of these interrelationships, it seems that the time is appropriate for the development of separate standards for each distinct level. District standards might include, for example, a thorough examination of interagency cooperation, and the interrelations of the district with state and regional organizations. Accountability and use of funds will be key factors for discussion in any such document, as will be the development of a research base for all future documents. It is true that the connections between the two sets of standards would have to be strenuously overseen, and that professionals at both levels would have to be fully cognizant of the content of the other document and the lines of communication identified. It is also true, however, that the content of information is so radically different now from that of only a few years ago that the potential of such an approach should be obvious.

It might be useful to consider the changes that should be made in *Media Programs: District and School* through examining the various

sections as they now exist. The chapter on media programs, objectives and user-centeredness should be rewritten in simple sentences that clearly express what is meant.[21] We need more examples of the kinds of objectives that lead to good programs. We might choose to sift through the literature in order to determine various objectives that could be identified as examples in standards, or we could seek the information from practicing professionals. We should at least consider some indication of the process for determination of objectives and user behavior that will help the professional community in working out various priorities. If we are to succeed in rewriting this chapter, we must use language that readily communicates to all who might use the document. Precision of terminology is essential, but unnecessary use of jargon or convoluted language is self-defeating. This chapter needs to include some consideration of the standards that are developed by other groups, particularly those of other ALA agencies. Recognition of the work of others in highly specialized areas that overlap with schooling is critical in this age of cost-accountability. The work of the Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies (ASCLA) on the development of standards for library service to the deaf is quite pertinent to our work, considering the effects of public law 94-142 on total library service.[22] The functions identified in this chapter are probably not as useful as now presented. If the analyses of those functions were moved to a chapter dealing with the management of a media center, the document might make more sense to the user. For example, the consultant role is neither explained in enough detail, nor is it related to the actual kinds of things the school media specialist might do. One of the inexplicable results of listings such as those in this chapter on the media program is the interpretation that all media specialists should be doing all these things. This kind of unreasoned response is not one sought by the profession, and is, at the same time, both impossible and limiting. We need to spell out quite precisely that the selection of alternatives and of some activities or objectives over others, in relation to the uniqueness of the particular setting and users, is the proper function of the school media specialist.

The facilities chapter should be revised to include the alternatives technological changes allow and, in some instances, demand.[23] The concept of large media centers with elaborate space allocations may not be the direction of the future. If the national position is to be valid and consistent, it should offer alternatives to this. Some treatment of the process of removing those spatial configurations that are not viable should be included. For example, if small conference rooms no longer work in the educational process, what do we do about altering the use of

such spaces? If large classrooms assigned for library instruction do not seem necessary, how can we convert them to alternative uses? One topic of importance in this chapter might be exploring how to take a media center apart once a building has been closed. This presents some serious questions on reallocation that have not been studied by the standards committees of the past.

Problems of security are paramount in the atmosphere of the eighties, and standards must also address this very real problem. How can we make the spaces that house our programs and resources safe to use and safe from theft and vandalism? This problem might be examined in terms of how we perceive our roles as educators who value positive attitudes toward human responsibility. To some extent, the problems of discipline and control of behavior are a small subset of the larger question. Previous standards never considered this problem, perhaps assuming, or at least hoping, that it did not exist.

The facilities section is probably the best place to explore some of the problems that arise in relation to invasion of privacy through technological means, including teacher access to student work on computers and reading records of any individual. It may also be the appropriate section in which to suggest standards for duplication of materials through technological means. Piracy is not unknown in the schooling community. Lastly, the potential of maintaining joint facilities with public libraries may be a viable alternative for some communities. How will standards provide for this and deal with new questions about the use of space, facilities and security which will inevitably result?

The chapter on collection design and management offers some very real suggestions to the professional community.[24] It should, however, be revised in light of some of the changes that have occurred in technology. For example, it may not be necessary to have as many differing types of media formats as once thought essential. Video capability, for example, may obviate the need for some other formats, although recent court decisions on the use of VTR equipment present a set of constraints that need to be examined. Obviously, a section on computer hardware and software is a priority, as is some guidance on the use of videodisc systems. Data base use, and the criteria for such participation, should also be included. It is probably in this chapter that a section might be devoted to standards regarding intellectual freedom and censorship in schools. Previous standards have only referred to very basic principles in this area and the various tools to aid in dealing with problems that arise, but never have they approached realistically the question in school media terms. Since the freedom/censorship issue is a current priority of the professional community, and a most frequently asked question by

practitioners, we should not ignore it in dealing with revisions. It is not the identification of the agencies from which help might be received in times of censorship that we need, but rather what specific principles should be the guidelines for action in schools. Although the rights of individual communities need to be considered, there may well be some identifiable principles that override such parochial approaches.

The question of charging for specific services that may or may not be available to all is a serious one, for which guidelines should be developed. Should students have to pay a fee for data base searches? Should teachers? Should students circulate computers and video recording equipment? Should libraries house a large collection of software that might be borrowed by students and teachers? What guides are necessary and useful?

Revisions in *Media Programs: District and School* should include a chapter devoted to managerial functions.[25] The competencies necessary to operate a media center could be identified and described. Budget alternatives may be outlined and guidelines provided for the selection of an appropriate budget system that would enhance the posture of the media center in the total schooling budget. The need to comprehend the financial picture of purchasing plans and contracts, maintenance contracts, bidding procedures, and buying plans is more acute than ever before. Nowhere does the current document address these issues, and the professional community would benefit greatly if they were confronted and guidelines determined.

The planning process is indeed one of the most important aspects of this chapter, both in terms of immediate planning and long-range endeavors. Targeting outcomes to meet the specific needs of schooling in a particular community may be critical to survival in that school. To some extent, a discussion of the funding process should be included in this chapter, with some attention to the grants process and the development of proposals for various state, federal and private funding agencies. The budget cuts of the past few years seem to call for a thorough discussion of alternative funds development.

The ALA Standards Committee was established to act as a liaison among all the various divisions and units of ALA. Through its manual and its continual monitoring of all ALA standards, it has tried to bring together the best possible information for the profession. I do not believe that AASL, or many other divisions, have used this committee effectively or to any great measure. Much could be learned from interaction with such a body that would enhance the final product, and those working on revisions should be encouraged to seek the counsel of this group.

Throughout this paper I have tried to identify some of the factors concerning standards for school media programs. I have supported the opinion that the current document is in need of major revision, and that any revisions should take into account all of the changes that have occurred in education during the past few years. It is probably true that the time is past for any single-minded approach to service-oriented standards. The national association(s) must use its authority to suggest to the profession a set of acceptable positions that might help us move forward in our work for children and youth. At the same time, it may be that we have reached a crisis point at which the association should ask if it is viable to continue standards as we have known them. It may be that each state and/or local governing body should develop its own media programs and services as it sees fit. I would like to believe that this is not the pattern to follow, that we should seek to provide more authoritative statements which offer to the professional community a set of guidelines indicating a kind of direction that will eventually enable the children of this country to enjoy and profit from the best qualities of our information-rich world. At the same time, I would like to see opportunities for diversity increased, and the individual media specialist encouraged to experiment with new and different approaches to meeting the needs of children and teachers. It may be that a reconsideration of some of the issues raised here will lead to a new vision of what school media program standards might become. Perhaps a new set of standards could set forth overriding principles which would be truly enforceable, just as professions such as medicine and law exercise some control over their practitioners. At the same time, these new standards might incorporate a greater recognition of the uniquenesses of individual situations and settings and the consequential need for practitioners to interpret such general principles into specific practices that best serve their own users. Standards should be seen as a means of encouraging the development of the best possible environments for learning and for personal growth for all users of school media centers. Effectively revised and implemented, these standards can provide guidance to school media specialists which will enhance their own competence and sense of relationship to a community of professionals; and ultimately these people can provide services to youngsters that will help them develop the critical abilities necessary to function effectively and happily in today's world and that of the future.

References

1. *See*: Cremin, Lawrence A. *The Transformation of the School*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961; _____. *Traditions of American Education*. New York: Basic Books, 1977; and Greene, Maxine. *The Public School and the Private Vision*. New York: Random House, 1965.

2. *See* Joyce, Bruce R. *Alternative Models of Elementary Education*. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing, 1969.

3. ALA American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. *Media Programs: District and School*. Washington, D.C.: AECT, 1975.

4. Bloss, Meredith. "Research; and Standards for Library Service." *Library Research* 2(Winter 1980):285-308; and Lancaster, F. Wilfrid. *The Measurement and Evaluation of Library Services*. Washington, D.C.: Information Resources Press, 1977, pp. 288-98.

5. Comparison to the various definitions as set forth by Bloss (cited above) indicates that school media standards do not meet criteria of acceptance. The most useful comparison is through the use of Lancaster's requirements for formulation of standards, including: research, measurability, definability, appropriateness, authoritativeness, and realism. *See* Lancaster, *Measurement and Evaluation*, p. 290.

6. *Evaluative Criteria*, 4th ed. Washington, D.C.: National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, 1969, used by several of the accrediting agencies, does at least acknowledge the existence of standards. The School Library Media Program of the Year Award, in conjunction with Encyclopaedia Britannica, assumes the principles and expectations of the standards in much of its evaluation process to determine the school system of merit. States such as Massachusetts and Pennsylvania have established standards that relate in some measure to the national standards. The state of Maryland has developed not only state standards for media programs, but also individual standards for facilities-planning based, in part, on national standards. Many of the state plans under federal legislation called for the use of the standards in evaluating programs throughout the state. For example, Massachusetts included the standards as a guide for advisory board review of model sites for the state demonstration program.

7. AASL and AECT, *Media Programs*, pp. 109-13.

8. The decision of the Board of Directors of AASL was an action that was to effect only the official documents and letters from the office of the executive director. In practice, it became the pattern in all of the literature from AASL. Indeed, the journal of the division has recently changed its name, despite the lack of formal action on the part of its editorial board. The membership at large was not asked to ratify its name change to *School Library Media Specialist*.

9. *See* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Yearbook Committee. *Improving the Human Condition*. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1978; _____. *Lifelong Learning: A Human Agenda*. Alexandria, Va.: ASCD, 1979; _____. *Considered Action for Curriculum Improvement*. Alexandria, Va., 1980; _____. *Staff Development/Organization Development*. Alexandria, Va.: ASCD, 1981. Another aspect of this problem is covered *in* Robert Taylor, ed. *The Computer in the School: Tutor, Tool, Tutee*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1980.

10. A three-page document, "Standards Data Collection Instrument," 10 Oct. 1981, was sent to the presidents of AASL-affiliate organizations, requesting them to survey 10 percent of their various memberships. The instrument is primarily concerned with title change, terminology and interest/usefulness levels of the previous standards. No indication is given that new areas are contemplated in any revisions.

11. American Association of School Librarians. *Standards for School Library Programs*. Chicago: ALA, 1960, (title page), pp. ix-xi.

12. Obviously, there are instances in technical matters when uniformity should be maintained, and these would be accounted for in what has been identified as "technical"

standards. Procedural standards may also be placed in the category of uniform approaches, although I think there may be some room for diversity.

13. "On July 1, 1981, the Statistics Section received the Bailey K. Howard-World Book Encyclopedia-ALA Goal Award to establish the goals, guidelines, timetable, and test specifications for a field test of the proposed revision of the ANSI Z39.7 Standard for Library Statistics." ("Z39 Project on Its Way." *LAMA Newsletter* 8(Jan. 1982):4.)

14. *See:* Joyce, Bruce, and Weil, Marsha. *Models of Teaching*, 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1980; Duncan, Michael J., and Biddle, Bruce J. *The Study of Teaching*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974; and Gage, Nathaniel L. *The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1978. For translation of theories into practice in the school media field, *see* Vandergrift, Kay E. *The Teaching Role of the School Media Specialist*. Chicago: ALA, 1979.

15. *See* Vandergrift, Kay E. *Child and Story: The Literary Connection*. New York: Neal-Schuman, 1980.

16. _____, *Teaching Role*, pp. 9-10.

17. Hannigan, Jane A. "A Call for New Jack the Giant Killers?" Proceedings of Technology and Change Conference, 1-4 Nov. 1981, Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh, (1982).

18. For contrasting views, *see*: Evans, Christopher. *The Micro Millenium*. New York: Viking, 1979; Papert, Seymour. *Mindstorms: Children, Computers, and Powerful Ideas*. New York: Basic Books, 1980; Weizenbaum, Joseph. *Computer Power and Human Reason*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, 1976; and Deken, Joseph. *The Electronic Cottage*. New York: William Morrow, 1982.

19. Probably the most useful languages to acquire as a school media specialist will be BASIC, PASCAL and LOGO.

20. The American National Standards Institute has developed ANSI X3.88-1981, guidelines for producing informative abstracts to describe computer programs. The abstracts are intended to aid the user to choose a program best suited to his or her needs and resources. This standard recommends that the abstract give sufficient information to a potential user, including the identification of required hardware and software.

21. *See* AASL and AECT, *Media Programs*, pp. 4-9.

22. "Techniques for Library Service to the Deaf and Hard of Hearing." *Interface* 4(Fall 1981):2-3; and The National Support Systems Project of the University of Minnesota. *A Common Body of Practice for Teachers: The Challenge of Public Law 94-142 to Teacher Education*. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1980.

23. *See* AASL and AECT, *Media Programs*, pp. 87-104.

24. Ibid., pp. 62-86.

25. Ibid., pp. 36-61.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Standards for Public Libraries

ROBERT H. ROHLF

OVER THE PAST FIFTY YEARS a large number of public librarians and many public library trustees have been preoccupied with the development of and/or need for public library standards. The first standards issued for public libraries were published by the American Library Association in 1934. In 1944 the Public Library Association (PLA) issued another set of standards for public libraries, and additional publications came forth in 1956 and again in 1966. It is interesting to note that it took more than fifty years of association existence before the first standards were issued by the American Library Association, but in a period of only thirty-six years, three more revised standards came forth; and in only another four years, the Public Library Association appointed a new standards committee to modify and revise the 1966 standards. What was happening was that the need for some kind of objective measurement—objective, whether qualitative or quantitative—was accelerating. The problem had been observed by most of the people involved in approving those 1966 standards—they really had to be updated more frequently than they had been in the past, society was simply changing so quickly.

For readers who wish to review the activities which led to the publications of the standards prior to 1970, Lowell Martin in an October 1972 *Library Trends* article[1] deals with the early history of public library standards development and needs in this country. Martin believes that the Public Library Association made a mistake in the 1960s

Robert H. Rohlf is Director, Hennepin County Library System, Edina, Minnesota, and past president of the Public Library Association.

when it decided simply to revise the 1956 standards document without adopting an entirely different approach to public library standards. Martin does point out, however, that the 1956 statement *Public Library Service: A Guide to Evaluation, with Minimum Standards* was redirected in the 1966 standards by the emphasis on systems. In fact, the very title of the 1966 standards reflects this: *Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems.*

One problem with public library standards that continues to plague the profession is that standards were never used in the sense that other professions have used them. For example, suppose hospitals were being considered here instead of libraries; if the hospitals do not meet state hospital standards, the hospitals are closed. But if libraries do not meet state library standards, people say, "Isn't that too bad." In some states, of course, certain state standards must be met to receive minimum amounts of state aid, but more often than not, while the standards might be in the regulations, they are not uniformly enforced. Therefore, in the sense of so many other professions, our standards are not really *standards,* even when we use the word *minimum,* which many people overlook. There are many who believe that the use of the word *norm* is more appropriate than the use of the word *standards.*

Another problem that has been persistent throughout the application of public library standards has been what Lowell Martin refers to as the question of the laggards versus the leaders. The leaders were always trying to rise above the standards and, in some cases, not even informing their budget people about them; and the laggards were always using the standards as an excuse to get either more money or more authority or more resources from whoever was doing the allocating. We therefore have had leaders in the very awkward position of trying to live standards down, and laggards trying to use them as a crtuch to elevate their libraries to where they think they should be. This has not been a very satisfactory arrangement. Lowell Martin also pointed out in the article he wrote about library trustees:

> People in general have no ready basis for judging library service as they do for some other facilities. A highway, they know, should be smooth and straight and fast. The standards are self-evident and they are relatively high. If proper standards are not achieved—when traffic backs up or the roadway has pot holes, for example—the motorist knows that something is wrong and he has no hesitation in voicing his opinion.
>
> But how fast and smooth and straight should his library be—that is, how many books should it have, of what quality, backed by what skills in the library staff? The average library user has little basis for judgment. If he gets what he wants he is grateful. If not, he often feels

> that he can't really expect the agency to suit his individual needs. Public library service is patently weak in many localities—it is remarkable how little public criticism one hears of these faltering agencies.[2]

The question of accreditation of public libraries also has been an issue on several occasions in the recent past, and the problem of standards or lack of standards became a real impediment to any discussion of the possibility of actually accrediting public libraries. In a proposal to develop criteria for judging quality of service, the PLA Committee to Study Accreditation of Public Libraries in 1967 stated "the problem": "Accreditation to be effective must be based on statistical measures closely related to quality. It follows that accreditation of a service-oriented operation such as a public library must be based on measurement of the quality of its service, i.e., the satisfaction of its users, or at least its capacity to satisfy their needs."[3] A major concern was the obvious problem of traditional statistics which were almost entirely quantitative and dealt with measuring the numerical level of activity or resources, and not necessarily with the effectiveness (or certainly, the quality) of activity or resources. In addition, a high level of suspicion existed even in regard to the accuracy of many reported statistics.

With increasing concern over the need for valid standards or for some other method of measuring effective library service, the Public Library Association Standards Committee in 1971 was reassigned the formidable task of developing a revised set of standards for public library services. PLA reported that because of financial constraints within the American Library Association, an ad hoc volunteer approach would be used, counting on active membership involvement within PLA and other ALA groups. The device used was the appointment of three task forces to be coordinated by the PLA Standards Committee, and each task force was given a one-year assignment to produce a working paper for the committee's internal use and guidance. The task forces were formed by age levels served (children, young adult and adult), and the task force papers were published in the *School Library Journal* in September 1973 in an attempt to achieve even more membership participation and involvement in the ongoing dialogue. In connection with publication of the working papers, the committee stated: "A constant frustration of all members, Committee and Task Force was the lack of a current, official glossary of library terminology."[4] What did the word *information* mean? Did it mean only data or only traditional reference function? For that matter, what did reference statistics include? At this time concern was also rising over how to deal

with standards in regard to growing network development, increased interlibrary planning, and onrushing technology linking more and more libraries together. With these concerns, the PLA Standards Committee determined to take a new approach to achieve agreement on goals for purposes and functions, and to publish papers for comment and debate. The committee reported that, "Given the wide variations in our nation's public libraries, the profession may well want to develop diversity by design, so that communities may have the choice of alternative patterns of library service."[5]

The complexities that the committee had to deal with, and the varying approaches that emerge when given such a free-form dialogue, were apparent in the published working papers: even their formats were different, let alone their approaches to the problem. These results could have been anticipated, and the papers and the apparent change of direction by the committee caused significant furor in the library press and in both committee and division meetings.

In a significant paper prepared for the Public Library Association in 1974, Ralph Blasingame and Mary Jo Lynch developed not only a theme of where standards had been going, but a possible redirection of what should take the place of standards in the future: "The present PLA Standards Committee...wanted to free themselves from traditional ways of thinking about public library service and open their minds to whatever new ideas might be useful in planning for the future. They knew that they wanted to consider not public libraries alone, but total community library service."[6] Blasingame and Lynch argued persuasively that an entirely different approach was needed from something even resembling the old type of national blueprint or standard, but that areas were different, communities were unique, and that a process rather than a formula was perhaps necessary. They went on to say, "[Public librarians] cannot use standards but they do need instruments, more sophisticated and sensitive than any currently available, which will enable them to 1) understand the particular community they are serving; 2) choose objectives in the light of that understanding; and 3) measure the degree to which these objectives are being met."[7] Blasingame and Lynch understood that some would object to this approach and would still want easy-to-follow formulas, but they argued that such an approach was too simplistic, that obviously communities vary greatly, that we need instruments which help us understand ourselves and which also leave us room to measure our service needs differently. They strongly supported the committee's approach to "the beginning of a design for diversity."[8]

The Blasingame and Lynch paper generated even more discussion and consideration of alternatives to standards. Some of the concern and confusion can perhaps be reflected in the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) publishing a *National Inventory of Library Needs, 1975.*[9] The NCLIS publication attempted to compare what it described as "indicators of need" with available resources, and while it was done with the use of library general information surveys administered by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) and working with an advisory committee, the publication still relied on guidelines established by professional groups and associations and not by anything approaching public needs or perceptions. In a 1976 article, Meredith Bloss, then chairperson of the newly renamed Goals, Guidelines and Standards (GGS) for Public Libraries Committee of PLA, commented that one of the additional problems of standards was:

> National standards for public library services are predicated solely on system services. Standards for school libraries are based on the theory that each school library or media center will meet the total needs of the school population. Standards for various kinds of library and informational services have been arrived at by committee deliberation and reflect desires of librarians about what ought to be done. Published standards show no evidence of liaison among libraries of different types. Standards are for libraries, not for library and informational service to people. It is not certain whether, if all libraries were brought up to standard, adequate total service would result.[10]

Bloss's review pointed up several interesting problems which PLA had yet to grapple with or, certainly, to solve. One of them was the statement that "the Association has long recognized...that the Standards are based on informed professional opinion rather than empirical research, and have thus had limited credibility.[11] In his review of the current problems facing the committee, Bloss reemphasized the advice the committee had received from Blasingame and Lynch and quoted them, saying:

> "What public librarians need now are...tools which will help them analyze a situation, set objectives, make decisions and evaluate achievements...." They suggested some rules of thumb to follow in this process: Think about "planning for the future rather than reporting on the past." Think about "management of a library rather than in comparison of one library with another....be concerned with outputs, i.e., what the user gets from a library," rather than inputs, i.e., staff, materials, equipment.[12]

As these reports and articles indicate, never in the history of the American Library Association had there been such open comment,

debate and questioning of the directions that public libraries should go toward developing standards, or whether even the development of such standards was desirable, let alone necessary. Many other activities were taking place in connection with this search either for new standards or for new processes by which to measure public library effectiveness. The Public Library Association cosponsored a study with the U.S. Office of Education to investigate alternative and additional methods of measuring library services focusing on outputs rather than inputs. (That focus goes on today at an even higher level, but this will be discussed more later.) Bloss concluded his article by stating: "A new approach to the development of standards is long overdue. It is a major undertaking, and the GGS committee is committed to the view that it must be done properly, with a sound evidential base, in order for it to be a creditable and useful product."[13]

In 1977 the Board of Directors of the Public Library Association adopted a draft statement at the 1977 ALA Annual Conference. The statement was entitled "A Mission Statement for Public Libraries—Guidelines for Public Library Service: Part 1." The statement was prefaced with the comment: "the results of a current PLA project—to design a process of standards development—should give lay and professional library leaders the tools to develop an entirely new approach to library standards. When these guidelines are complete they will replace the 1966 public library standards and will serve as the profession's guide to public library development until the publication of new standards in the mid-1980s."[14] In releasing the "Mission Statement," PLA publicly acknowledged that the approach to standards was being turned around and future emphasis would be on needs and services for people—not for institutions. PLA also announced that no new standards would be issued prior to 1980, and that perhaps a new process was needed to develop other than standards as historically understood.

A concise review of both the development of the process and its hopes for the future was presented in an article by Mary Jo Lynch.[15] She stated that essentially the study consisted of a step-by-step approach to planning, together with methods, instructions and sample instruments which had been tested at three different library sites in the country. These sites had been chosen to represent various types and sizes of public libraries with the hope that some uniform approach to the process could be developed even if measurements might vary greatly at the end of the process. The planning process as developed by the contractor went through a series of reviews with a steering committee, and by independent consultants who seved as critics. After a second draft of the manual

was ready, a group of public library leaders not previously involved in the project spent four days at a workshop and evaluation seminar simulating the planning process. The actual *A Planning Process* was published in spring 1980.[16]

Meanwhile, the never-ending search for standards within the American Library Association continued, even though large segments of ALA were insisting that standardization days were over. The ALA Standards Committee issued a report to ALA Council at the 1981 Midwinter Meeting in which it distinguished four types of standards: (1) service or performance standards, (2) technical standards, (3) procedural standards, and (4) educational standards. The committee report stated that: "The ALA Standards Committee recommends to Council that the establishment of service or performance standards should remain the responsibility solely of type of library divisions, that standards for library education remain the responsibility of a committee on accreditation, and that the ALA By-Laws be revised to permit type of activity divisions to establish technical and procedural standards."[17] This document indicated not only a continuing concern with measurable criteria, but another splintering of who would be responsible for establishing standards. One is reminded of Meredith Bloss's concern in 1975 that our standards did not interconnect.

What did the publication of the new process manual do to the chances of issuing new standards in 1980? First, the new planning process breaks tradition. It reviews existing service programs, establishes priorities, and goes on to consider modifications and alternatives in the program. Carried out thoroughly, it constitutes a fresh hard look that may result in significiant change. The basic questions in the process do not involve comparing yourself in a particular library situation to a so-called standard (in terms of square feet of physical facilities, number of volumes in collections, number of titles in collections, number of staff per so many thousand population); rather, it asks five basic questions. These questions are:

> Does our library service, as it has developed to this time, represent the best possible pattern for the future?
>
> Does it meet the most pressing needs of our community, and reflect changes occurring in the area?
>
> Does it consider other sources of information available to our people?
>
> Do the library's priorities for service and for those to be served match the characteristics of the community population and their library needs?
>
> Given the constraints on time and money that we face, are we providing the most effective library services possible?[18]

The new planning process is not a simple training manual, nor is it a quick fix. Neither is it something someone else should do for you, such as comparing standards—numerical, qualitative, or otherwise. It is a guideline for you to do something. On the other hand, unlike previous standards, the planning manual, which should result in specific standards for a specific community, is not a chemistry handbook; it is more like a cookbook. One only has to use those parts of the process which apply to his/her own community. One does not have to use all of the process, nor compare the library in every aspect with any other library. The new process does rely on measurement and evaluation, as the previous standards have done, but it requires usable objectives which reflect the basic functions of a particular library, and not numbers or standards of some other library, in perhaps some other part of the country or even some other part of the same state.

The question of state standards also has continually arisen during this whole debate over new national standards. State standards continue to be developed and applied in many states. One fundamental difference in the application of standards within states has often been that, with the advent of federal Library Services and Construction Act monies intermingled with state aid monies, the state often has a financial carrot with which to cajole the use or application of state standards. States are often in a position to require a library to maintain certain minimum standards in order for it to qualify for state aid. The standards have been applied irregularly throughout the country and, in many cases, irregularly within one state. They nevertheless can be applied with the threat of withholding state aid if local libraries do not meet certain statewide standards. On the positive side, state standards are probably more uniformly applicable than are national standards. On the other hand, there are enormous ranges of difference within virtually every state in the country in the economic and social characteristics of communities. An obvious example would be the difference between the Chicago Public Library and its needs, and the Cairo, Illinois, Public Library and its needs. Are the same per capita standards applicable as they may relate to volumes, expenditures, staff members, square feet of building, etc.? Similar to ALA's experience with national standards, many states are finding statewide standards difficult first to develop, and second to use as instruments of state policy. Nevertheless, there is an increase in the development of state standards—even when those standards, as mentioned above, are not applied in the sense of other professions, such as health-applied standards. Relatively recently developed state standards exist in New Mexico, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Wisconsin, Minne-

sota, and North Dakota. Also, many other states are in the process of either upgrading existing state standards, or developing new ones where none previously existed.

How do the states respond to the new public library planning process in lieu of national standards? David McKay, North Carolina State Librarian, writes:

> Traditionally, the state library's planning and justification for state aid for public libraries were based on a comparison of North Carolina public library statistics with national and state standards. The shortfalls (mainly for materials, personnel, and plant) were noted, and an appropriation was requested to close the gap and thus bring the public libraries up to standard. In the fall of 1976, however, the incoming administration and legislature requested information on public library services of such breadth and depth that a completely new approach to planning had to be found.
>
> What the legislature and administration were demanding was more accountability for state-funded programs, as well as more precision in evaluating these programs. And while they did not reject out of hand the justification for higher funding levels based on attaining standards, or the conclusions of the *National Inventory of Library Needs* that North Carolina's public libraries require approximately twice the staff, twice the materials, and twice the square footage of current conditions to provide good library service, they wanted more information on programs and how these programs were meeting demonstrated community needs.
>
> The challenge for the state library, then, was immediately to develop a statewide needs assessment from which an analysis of services could be made. Following the needs assessment, a long-range plan was essential at the local level if the state's plan was to reflect the real library world in North Carolina.[19]

In investigating how North Carolina could meet these questions and requirements, the state library staff considered the decades-old community analysis process, and the updatings, revisions and strengthenings of that process that have occurred in recent years, particularly through the work at Syracuse University, and now at the University of Southern California. Combining this process with the procedures set forth in the new planning process manual, with emphasis on the fact that the planning process both uses a planning committee and is cyclical (rather than static) in nature, the state staff concluded that the application of the planning process to North Carolina public libraries was not only desirable but essential. McKay stated further that: "Without doubt, the major contribution of PLA's manual is to move away from the old limited quantitative standards toward the assessment of the whole library operation, including the assessment of programs and

services. If communities differ, and they surely do, *A Planning Process* will aid the library manager in tailoring the institution and its services to meet the particular needs of the community."[20]

While the *Planning Process* manual in its first edition certainly needs much improvement before any further results can be achieved on a national level, it has obviously been accepted as a necessary step toward a new definition of service and quality for public libraries. The PLA Board of Directors acknowledged the continuing emphasis on evaluation and measurement based on performance in lieu of static standards in a statement adopted at the 1981 ALA Annual Conference in San Francisco:

> ...there have been substantial changes in the approcah to guidelines and standards preparation for the needs of public libraries....
>
> *The Public Library Mission Statement and its Imperatives for Service* pointed out that future standards for public libraries must flow from the needs of institutions. This meant that goals and specific quantifiable, measurable objectives should be determined by each library and library system in terms of local community concerns and needs.[21]

A manual on performance measurements for public libraries has been completed by the PLA Goals, Guidelines and Standards for Public Libraries Committee.[22] The manual brings together examples of existing methods of performance measurements and provides specific examples, charts, tables, and procedures for measuring specific library performance.

Where are we going from here? Is the Public Library Association now content to sit back and say that there will no longer be any national standards or even national norms promulgated or promoted by PLA or ALA? No! The Public Library Association is continuing to work on the creation of statistical information both of a qualitative and quantitative measure that can help libraries assess the role they are playing in their communities and their individual weaknesses and needs. The current Goals, Guidelines and Standards Committee of PLA has developed a series of output measures that can assist libraries in evaluating their effectiveness, not only a local but also on a national level. These twelve criteria are: (1) title fill rate; (2) browsing fill rate; (3) subject information fill rate; (4) response time; (5) reference and information service; (6) circulation per capita; (7) in-library use; (8) collection turnover; (9) registration as a percentage of the population; (10) program attendance; (11) number of people who use library services, categorized three ways—(a) traffic in a building, (b) phone and mail use, (c) contacts out-

side library; and (12) workload measures. In discussing which measure to be used, the committee cited the following important points:

> 1. It is very important that these measures be easy to use and appropriate for small libraries as well as large systems.
> 2. Widespread use of the measures could eventually lead to the development of norms for categories of service in libraries of different sizes.
> 3. The potential for comparison of statistics with other libraries will in itself encourage libraries to use the measures.
> 4. The measurement manual should complement the planning process assisting libraries in the integration of planning and everyday work.
> 5. Any future manuals should include caveats about where measures may be invalid....
> 7. Measurements will be limited to output measures, not efficiency and not impact measures. The terms "output measures," "performance measures" and "measures of effectiveness" were used.[23]

The goal of the steering committee working through the Baltimore County Public Library, which has a contract with a research firm, is to develop a manual that will introduce each measure, define it, detail the procedures and forms for collecting and reporting it, and discuss how performance and the measure might be improved. Test libraries will be involved. It is hoped that after the end of the test, a series of output measurements and definitions will be developed by the PLA Goals, Guidelines and Standards Committee for the PLA Board of Directors. Given the present timetable, such approval is possible at the 1982 ALA Annual Conference.

None of this activity precludes the possible issuance of new national standards by the Public Library Association in the future, but this activity does indicate that, in all probability, any new standards which are issued, even to the extent of being termed *norms*, will be significantly different in their approach and application than the various standards issued in the past fifty years. It is very probable that any new standards or measurements or norms of any kind which are developed or promulgated by PLA or ALA in the future will be very close to those criteria offered by Ralph Blasingame and Mary Jo Lynch when they suggested that any new criteria should: "1) 'be directed mainly toward planning for the future rather than on reporting the past,' 2)'be useful in the management of a particular library rather than in comparison of one library with another,' and 3) 'be concerned with outputs—what the user gets from a library,' rather than inputs—that is, what the funds enable a library to acquire in the way of staff,

materials and equipment."[24] There is little doubt that in the future, libraries will be forced primarily to measure what services they are providing, not what resources they have.

References

1. Martin, Lowell. "Standards for Public Libraries." *Library Trends* 21(Oct. 1972):164-77; *see especially* pp. 168-70.

2. ———. "The Trustee and ALA Standards." In *The Library Trustee*, 2d ed., edited by Virginia G. Young, p. 108. Chicago: ALA, 1969.

3. Public Library Association. Committee to Study Accreditation of Public Libraries. Project application. Chicago: ALA, 1967. (unpublished)

4. ALA Public Library Association. Standards Committee Task Forces. "Community Library Services—Working Papers on Goals and Guidelines." *Library Journal* 96(15 Sept. 1973):2604.

5. Ibid., p. 2605.

6. Blasingame, Ralph, and Lynch, Mary Jo. "Design for Diversity: Alternatives to Standards for Public Libraries." *PLA Newsletter* 13(June 1974):4.

7. Ibid., p. 6.

8. Ibid., p. 20.

9. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. *National Inventory of Library Needs, 1975*. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1977.

10. Bloss, Meredith. "Standards for Public Library Service—Quo Vadis?" *Library Journal* 101(1 June 1976):1259.

11. Ibid., p. 1261.

12. Blasingame and Lynch, "Design for Diversity," p. 19. Quoted *in* Bloss, "Standards," p. 1261.

13. Bloss, "Standards," p. 1262.

14. Public Libraries Association. Goals, Guidelines and Standards Committee. "A Mission Statement for Public Library Service: Part I." *American Libraries* 8(Dec. 1977):615.

15. Lynch, Mary Jo. "Public Library Planning: A New Approach." *Library Journal* 105(15 May 1980):1131-34.

16. Palmour, Vernon E., et al. *A Planning Process for Public Libraries*. Chicago: ALA, 1980.

17. 1980-81 ALA Council Document No. 6 Revised. (unpublished)

18. Palmour, *Planning Process*, pp. 1-2.

19. McKay, David N. "A State Agency View of PLA's New Planning Process." *Public Libraries* 19(Winter 1980):115.

20. Ibid., p. 116.

21. "Evolution of PLA Public Library Standards, 1981." Adopted by PLA Board of Directors, 1981 ALA Annual Conference, San Francisco.

22. Zweizig, Douglas, and Rodger, Eleanor J. *Output Measures for Public Libraries; A Manual of Standardized Procedures*. Chicago: Public Library Association, [1982].

23. Public Library Association. Minutes of the Public Library Output Measures Steering Committee, 14 July 1981. (unpublished)

24. Blasingame and Lynch, "Design for Diversity," p. 19. Quoted *in* Bloss, "Standards," p. 1261.

Standards for State Libraries

F. WILLIAM SUMMERS

FOR MUCH OF THEIR history, American state libraries have followed a rather unplanned and unguided process of development. The movement for state library development began about the turn of the century, and by 1909 thirty-four states had established an agency to promote the development of public library services.[1]

From the beginning these agencies were very diverse, founded for differing reasons and offering a wide variety of services. This pattern has persisted to the present. In most states, the term *State Library* has a specific meaning to that state alone. Some state libraries are concerned with public library development, others are not. In recent years it has become the pattern to refer to the agency concerned with the development of public library services across the state as the "state library agency" regardless of the official title of the organization, and whether or not that title includes the phrase "state library."

The movement to establish state library agencies in every state developed slowly through this century. It received significant impetus in the 1930s through a project operated by ALA, and funded by the Rosenwald Foundation, which placed a "library worker" in the South to spur library development. The first systematic effort to define and make quantitative statements about these agencies occurred in the 1930s when ALA began issuing a series of leaflets entitled "The Role of the State Library." These leaflets may be seen as the precursors of standards, because they attempted to spell out the services which a state library

F. William Summers is Dean, College of Librarianship, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

should provide, the kinds of personnel it should have, and the legal basis upon which good public library development should rest.

The depression years were difficult ones for public libraries in general, and were especially critical periods for state libraries. It was exceedingly difficult to make progress while the nation was in severe economic difficulty. One major thrust of this era was a rather widespread effort to obtain state money for local libraries—a priority, no doubt, dictated by the financial difficulties which cities were having in providing essential services during this period. Many state libraries also cooperated extensively with state-level WPA (Work Projects Administration) projects, especially those relating to state and local history and bibliographic work. The years of World War II were also a period of slow development in state libraries. Not only was there a shortage of personnel and money, but perhaps equally important, there was a shortage of gasoline, which made it very difficult for state library extension workers to travel about the state engaging in efforts to establish and improve libraries.

What might be called the heyday of state libraries began in the postwar years. First, there was general recognition that library development in the states had to proceed on a planned basis with state leadership and support. Second, there was a realization that effective library service across the states was going to require the creation of larger units of library service (systems), and that the effective agency for bringing about cooperation among the various levels of government involved was the state. Third, there was recognition that large numbers of American citizens lacked access to public library service. This latter point became the rallying cry for efforts for federal support of public library service, which succeeded in 1955 with the passage of the Library Services Act (LSA). The decision to place responsibility for administering the federal funds with the states was a major stimulus to the development of state agencies. The few remaining states which had not accepted or implemented responsibility for public library development at the state level were quick to do so. In many states the new personnel necessary to administer the funds were added to the agency staffs. In all too many cases, these new positions were funded from federal rather than state funds, a problem which has continued to plague some state agencies.

Federal funds also brought the necessity, opportunity and the wherewithal for the states to engage in systematic planning of their library services, and also dollars to support the implementation of those plans. Regardless of one's philosophy about the role of the federal government in supporting state and local services, the success of LSA

and its successor, the Library Services and Construction Act, is a clear incidence of federal dollars producing rather dramatic results in a relatively short time.

The rapid development in state-level programs brought on by the federal activity resulted in a need for the states to know more about their own library structures, and this need was recognized by the American Association of State Libraries (AASL), which in 1957 appointed a Survey and Standards Committee chaired by Carma Leigh.[2]

The work of this committee led to a grant from the Carnegie Corporation to fund a research project to obtain basic information on all state agencies providing library services and to establish standards for state libraries.[3] The study team was initially headed by Robert D. Leigh, and upon his death in 1961, Dr. Phillip Monypenny assumed responsibility for the study. As is all too often the case, publication of the study occurred long after its completion, but the members of the AASL Survey and Standards Committee were in close contact with the study, and used data gathered by the study so that the first state library standards were issued by ALA in 1963, with the commentary of the study appearing three years later.

When the standards appeared in 1963, AASL appointed a Standard Evaluation Committee which reported annually, and which recommended needed changes in 1967. In January 1968 a Standards Revision Committee was appointed, and the revised standards appeared in 1970. The revised standards are not radically different from the 1963 version. In 1977 the Association of State Library Agencies (ASLA) appointed a Standards Review Committee to revise the 1970 standards.[4]

In discussing the work of revising the standards, Eberhart in his article cited earlier raised a number of conceptual and practical problems, including the following:

> 1. Whether or not there can be standards for organizations as diverse and complex as the state libraries across the nation.
> 2. Another conceptual difficulty is that the activity of state library agencies involves areas where other library groups already have standards or interests, e.g., state institutions, public libraries.
> 3. Differences in the development of systems and networking capability including the fact that there may be several networks operating in some states and none in others.[5]

Obviously these were substantial and difficult questions, because the committee was disbanded in 1980 and the efforts to revise the 1970 standards ceased. At present, the Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies (ASCLA), successor to ASLA, has an ad hoc

subcommittee on Standards for the Library Functions at the State Level, which is attempting to ascertain the need, and necessary content, for standards.[6]

There appear, then, to be two significant questions: Do state library agencies need new standards? If so, can these be written? These questions will be addressed later.

The Present State Library Standards

While the 1970 standards rest upon the research project carried out by Monypenny, it must be pointed out that this foundation is not as strong as might be desired. First, the study was largely descriptive in natuie. It identified the characteristics of state libraries and discussed the range of services provided, but the study was neither evaluative nor predictive. It did not identify the elements which assured strength in a program, or those which were associated with weaknesses. In fact, given the importance which has been ascribed to them, state library programs have been the subject of relatively little substantive research.

St. Angelo, Hartsfield and Goldstein attempted to explain the variations in state legislative support for the state library agency and public library program. Their findings indicated some significant differences with previous perceptions of state libraries which are worth restating:

> 1. Every state library agency is free to develop a strong program. Library programs are not limited or encouraged by the level of a state's economy, social development, educational programs, political conditions, or administrative structure....
> 2. Past expenditure and program practices do not limit the ability of agencies to develop strong programs....
> 3. Federal aid has been going more heavily to state agencies which are underfunded, but have been innovative in programming and high in their attainment of professional standards.
> 4. Quality programs that do not require much funding appear to be a matter of internal agency leadership....
> 5. On the other hand, combined success in attaining quality programs and sizable appropriation support requires an active political program designed to influence policy members....
> 6. Library development is not tied to educational development. It is just as possible for strong library programs to develop in states with weak educational programs as not. Conversely, strong educational programs are not consistently coupled with strong library programs.[7]

Overall, these findings suggest that the quality of a state library program is not economically or socially determined and results from the

free will decisions in the state. Further, the study suggests that two leadership traits are necessary for success—innovation and professionalization must be coupled with political activity on behalf of the state library program by the state library agency.[8]

It is not surprising that the standards lay great stress on the leadership role of the state library agency, charging it with a variety of leadership tasks, including the following major responsibilities:

> 1. leadership in the development of state-wide plans involving all types of libraries at all levels within the state;
> 2. encouraging and facilitating cooperation across state lines;
> 3. developing a state-wide coordinated library system;
> 4. setting minimal standards to qualify for state financial grants;
> 5. exercise leadership in maintaining the freedom to read;
> 6. exert leadership to effect exchange of information and materials through networks.[9]

There is no research to indicate how well state library agencies have discharged these broad leadership responsibilities. Observationally, it could be suggested that this leadership has been in direct proportion to the dollars available to spend on various kinds of development—stronger, therefore, in the case of public library systems, and weaker in the case of interlibrary cooperation. This hypothesis would suggest that declining federal support and stasis or retrenchment at the state level would serve to diminish the state library's leadership.

The literature does not indicate any research efforts to measure the impact of the standards. Nor is there the usual anecdotal literature about successes achieved through the use of standards. Yet absence of literature does not of itself indicate absence of impact. For the most part, the standards are sufficiently broad that few people could quarrel with them. Many of them are more self-evident truths or statements of common good practice, for example: "An architect should be commissioned who combines the abilities to plan for functional needs and to design an aesthetically satisfying structure compatible with other state buildings."[10]

What then are the weaknesses of the present standards?

1. Like most library standards, they are based upon a very limited research base, and it is difficult if not impossible to establish a relationship between achievement of the standard and the quality of the library services which will be produced.
2. The standards are almost completely nonquantified. Therefore, it is difficult to make statements about the levels of achievement of the standards, or to know what level of activity is required to meet them.

3. In the final analysis, the standards rest upon a pooling of professional opinion. However, sincere or even valid such an opinion is, it is always open to a charge of being self-serving.

Toward a New View of State Library Standards

It is not difficult to suggest a need for revision of the state library standards. Enormous changes have occurred in society and in libraries since 1970, and the standards are either silent or address weakly many of these issues. Primary targets for the revisions would appear to be the following:

1. The standards lay great stress upon the role of the state library in arranging or, if necessary, providing service to unserved populations. This battle has been won for the most part, and need not receive the same emphasis in the future. Far greater emphasis needs to be placed upon the state's responsibility to ensure the quality of access which citizens have to library services.
2. The standards attempt to deal with the diverse organizational characteristics of library services at the state level. Monypenny described an idealized model called a "comprehensive state library" which, it was noted, existed in only a few states.[11]

   There is probably a need for the standards to deal more decisively with the "fractionating" of library functions at the state level, certainly at least in the areas of system development, interlibrary cooperation and networking. It is probably far too late for the standards (or any other mechanism) to bring about the kind of unified agency modeled. The standards should address the issue of how effective coordination and action can occur with academic, public and school library interests in separate administrative units, as is frequently the case.
3. The standards project the state library agency in the principal leadership and activity role with respect to the development of all types of libraries. These standards need to be made stronger and to indicate some process for gaining acceptance in this wider role. In too many states the state library agency is seen as a public library agency only, and it vies with a number of other organizations for the leadership role, among them major state universities and the large metropolitan library systems.

   Despite frequent cries for a strong state library agency, very little actual support is demonstrated in the professional community for proposals which would strengthen state libraries.

4. The standards call for shared financial support from social, state and federal sources. Over the years there have been various discussions about and proposals to define the proportion of total cost which each level should bear, a task which thus far has been frustrating and fruitless. The standards would perhaps identify the role or level of responsibility which each should assume in the total program. In the field of education, for example, the roles have been for the state to assure a minimum level of education available to all (in many instances a very minimal level), for the localities to fund programs beyond this level which they considered important, and for the federal government to support activities in which there was a national priority—e.g., better nutrition, science, math, foreign-language education, and the like.

   The proper proportion of support for each level would then be a factor of the roles and functions assigned to that level, rather than a fixed proportion which is difficult to establish and to maintain as conditions change over time.
5. The present standards lay great stress upon defining the quality of state library personnel, upon assessing their freedom from political control. The standards also indicate that all employees should be under a well-developed classification and pay plan, and comparable to other professional workers in state service. A major problem for state library agencies is that state salaries frequently do not keep pace with other levels of government. Consequently, many public, university and school libraries offer more attractive salaries than state library agencies. This problem is especially critical at the top levels. It is safe to say that there are relatively few state library agencies in which the salaries of the state librarian and top assistants compare favorably with those paid to top administrators in major academic and public libraries in the state. If the state library is to play the leadership role envisioned by the standards, it must have top-quality personnel and be enabled to compete with leading libraries for them. The revised standards must lay a clear rationale for separating the salary levels in state library agencies from the general state salary schedule, and linking them to those paid in the state's academic and health agencies, which tend to be exceptions to the general salary structure in most states.

Eberhart questioned whether standards could be written for agencies as diverse as the state libraries, and suggested that perhaps "guidelines" to indicate qualitative aspects of programs might be more

feasible.[12] His suggestion has merit, but such statements are likely to have lesser impact.

Another approach might be to seek to define the services which state libraries should provide, and whenever possible, specify levels of performance which should be expected. If the state has a responsibility for interlibrary loan, how responsive should that service be? If it has a responsibility to provide consultant service to libraries, how frequent should that service be? Without greater efforts at quantification and specificity, it will be difficult to prepare a document which is more than an idealized and general description of a state library.

References

1. St. Angelo, Douglas, et al. *State Library Policy: Its Legislative and Environmental Contexts.* Chicago: ALA, 1971, p. 1.
2. Monypenny, Phillip. *The Library Functions of the States.* Chicago: ALA, 1966, p. iii.
3. Ibid.
4. Eberhart, W. Lyle. "Standards for State Library Agencies." *Library Trends* 27(Fall 1978):209-12.
5. Ibid., p. 211.
6. Sandra M. Cooper to Summers, personal communication, 5 Jan. 1982.
7. St. Angelo, et al., *State Library Policy,* pp. 63-64.
8. Ibid., p. 42.
9. American Association of State Libraries. Standards Revision Committee. *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level.* Chicago: ALA, 1970.
10. Ibid., p. 32.
11. Monypenny, *Library Functions,* p. 47.
12. Eberhart, "Standards for State Library Agencies," p. 209.

The Gap in Standards for Special Libraries

JAMES BEAUPRÉ DODD

THE DIVERSITY THAT Cowgill and Havlik[1] discussed in 1972 in a previous article on this topic in *Library Trends* remains the starting point of any consideration of uniformity or standardization of special libraries.

The issue of standards for special libraries brings to mind the fable about the boy whose father gave him a bundle of switches to break. The lad learned that the switches could not be broken all at one time, but that they could easily be broken one at a time. Special libraries comprise such a large and heterogeneous group that no successful effort has been made to establish standards that would apply to all of them. Instead, efforts have been concentrated on developing standards for groups of special libraries. Other articles in this issue cover such more nearly homogeneous subsets as hospital and medical libraries, libraries serving the institutionalized, library services for the visually and hearing impaired, and special libraries within academic and public libraries.

In 1979, Markuson and Woolls[2] reported that the U.S. library system consists of 12,000 special libraries—more than the combined total of 3000 academic libraries and 8307 public libraries. The exact mix of this multiverse of special libraries is not precisely known. However, two recent estimates give some indication of the distribution. In 1981, Dodd reported to the joint National Commission on Libraries and Information Science/Special Libraries Association (NCLIS/SLA) Task Force on the Role of the Special Library in Nationwide Networks and

James Beaupré Dodd is Head, Users Services Division, Price Gilbert Memorial Library, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta.

Cooperative Programs[3] a tabulation made from the 1977 publication, *Institutions Where SLA Members Are Employed.*[4] Dodd's count showed 58 percent worked in for-profit organizations, 16 percent in academic libraries, 8 percent in government agencies, 7 percent in public libraries, and 7 percent in associations or other private nonprofit organizations. The remainder worked in school libraries, medical libraries or law libraries. The accuracy of this count is limited because: (1) the directory could list only those SLA members who gave their business addresses on the membership application or renewal form; (2) it is a listing of personnel, not libraries; and (3) the categories given were not mutually exclusive. For instance, some law libraries are in profit-making organizations, as are some medical libraries. At the same time, Ruth D. Rodriguez, manager, Membership Department, Special Libraries Association, reported to the task force a simplified breakdown of the employment situations of the membership: 55 percent in corporate libraries, 22 percent in government or other social service libraries, 13 percent in academic (including school) libraries, and 10 percent in public libraries.[5]

These tabulations indicate that a large percentage of special libraries are in profit-making organizations, mostly in business and industry. Because of the existence of these special libraries, the "divide and conquer" approach to standards for special libraries has not been entirely successful. Still valid is former SLA President Strable's 1974 comments to NCLIS:

> A sizable proportion of special libraries spring from, and are very much a part of, the capitalistic system. And this is a system which emphasizes competition, individuality, privateness and other characteristics which are in opposition to commonality of goals and activities. In addition, all special libraries, whether in the profit sector or not, have long followed traditions based on non-standardization, unalikeness, and uniqueness. Much has always been made of how well the special library eschews slavishness to the norms followed in other types of libraries, but rather chooses adaptation or the creation of new techniques in order to meet the special needs of special clienteles. The universality of this tradition has never been measured or tested. But it is an ever-present and important element in the self image of special librarians.[6]

A factor that Strable did not touch upon is that the private sector is not sensitive to pressures for accreditation or certification. There are no unions and no government regulations that are in a position to effect performance standards in a private library, and the library profession itself does not yet have the clout of enforcement that other professions such as medicine, accounting and law have.

The innate resistance to conformity that Strable writes about is not the only difficulty in determining and applying standards to these special libraries. It is within this group that the greatest amount of all special library diversity is found. The sizes of the libraries range from the one-person operation to the massive libraries and library networks that are to be found in large corporations. Also, standards that might be meaningful for a chemical research organization would not necessarily be valid for a bank library, regardless of size.

Efforts to establish standards applicable to all special libraries have been tangential in approach rather than direct frontal assaults on the problem. The most persistent efforts concern salaries. In 1982, the Special Libraries Association will conduct its seventh salary survey of its membership. The previous ones were reported in *Special Libraries* for the years 1959, 1967, 1970, 1973, 1976, and 1979.[7] The purposes of the salary surveys were stated in the 1979 report, as follows:

> To obtain systematic accurate information about the salaries of special librarians and information personnel; to establish a data bank from which inquiries about salaries can be answered for members of the Special Libraries Association, for persons engaged in personnel and recruitment activities, and for persons planning special library careers; to enable SLA members to assess their own salaries in view of the numerous variables.[8]

To supplement the in-depth triennial surveys, SLA has conducted interim updates in recent years by sending a smaller questionnaire to only 25 percent of the membership. The most recent update, published in October 1981, states the purpose of the survey to be "an effort to assist special librarians in salary negotiations...." It states further: "The results provide an overview of the salaries of special librarians and a measure of annual salary increases since the last survey."[9]

For the 1982 survey, the association staff, particularly Dr. Mary Frances A. Hoban, manager, Professional Development, is collaborating with the SLA Statistics Committee, chaired by Beth G. Ansley, in order to use the survey to gather additional statistical information about the association and "to make it a more valid document for wage and salary negotiations." Ansley further reports that: "Members of the Statistics Committee have met with professionals in the wage and salary field in order to obtain their expert, external view of what the survey should contain."[10]

SLA continues to make another, though less effective, effort to establish a minimum salary standard for special libraries. Since April 1974, the association has issued a leaflet entitled *Employment Oppor-*

tunities. It is: "issued monthly...as a service to SLA members who are seeking positions and to employers who are seeking qualified special librarians....Positions with starting salaries of $10,000/year or more are listed in *Employment Opportunities* as 'Professional Positions.' Positions with starting salaries less than $10,000/year or with non-professional requirements are listed as 'other.' "[11] The initial minimum salary designated "professional" in this leaflet was $9000. Some SLA members think that the $10,000 figure is too low. The most recent decision by the Board of Directors on this matter was in June 1980, when it did not act on a recommendation from the chapter cabinet that the figure be raised to $12,500.[12]

Cowgill and Havlik[13] discussed the 1964 publication in *Special Libraries* of "Objectives and Standards for Special Libraries."[14] When that article was later reprinted in 1970 by SLA as a separate pamphlet, the title was shortened to "Objectives for Special Libraries," and the "Appendix: Standard Specifications" was dropped. The deleted material was concerned only with physical standards for shelving, lighting and stack area arrangement, and had nothing to do with service or performance standards.

The Special Libraries Association has continued to have a standards committee under one name or another, and continues to be a voting member of the American National Standards Committee Z39.

A brief recounting of the activities of the SLA committee will show that it has been fully occupied with problems other than performance and service standards. At the time the Cowgill and Havlik article was written in 1972, Cowgill was chairman of the Standards Committee.[15] His untimely death shortly thereafter caused a brief hiatus in the work of that committee. Under the later leadership of Fred J. O'Hara (1973-75), Zoe Cosgrove (1975-77), Scott Kennedy (1977-78), LeRoy Linder (1978-80), and Audrey Grosch (1980-82), the committee has been concerned with such issues as:

surveys and statistics;
projected manpower needs;
a commonly accepted definition of special libraries;
a system of classification and categorization of special libraries;
job descriptions for exempt and nonexempt library employees;
liaison with the National Center for Education Statistics;
representation on the ALA/LAD, Library Organization and Management Section, Statistics Coordinating Committee;
common bibliographic exchange format;
AACR2;

ANSI Z39.7; and
recommendations from the White House Conference on Library and Information Services.[16]

The SLA Standards Committee was renamed the Standards and Statistics Committee in 1976. In June 1978, the 1977-78 Board of Directors of SLA acted to dissolve the Standards and Statistics Committee. One week later, the 1978-79 Board of Directors authorized the reestablishment of two committees: the Standards Committee and the Statistics Committee. The Statistics Committee has since been chaired by Scott Kennedy (1978-80) and by Beth G. Ansley (1980-82), and continues work on statistical concerns of the former Standards and Statistics Committee.[17] The makeup and the definition of the Standards Committee was most recently changed by action of the Board of Directors in October 1981:

> *Standards Committee*
> Five members appointed for overlapping terms of three years each. Members may be appointed as SLA representatives to other organizations serving a similar purpose; or, as the President shall see fit, SLA representatives to such organizations may serve as ex officio members of the Committee for the terms of their appointments. Ex officio members shall participate fully in all the Committee's activities.
>
> The Committee shall: (1) identify and disseminate to Association members existing and proposed standards for services, facilities, staffs and resources of special libraries and information centers; (2) review proposed standards and initiate ideas for new standards related to special libraries and information centers; and (3) serve as liaison between the Association and other organizations concerned with standards.[18]

The purpose of authorizing the ex officio members is to strengthen the relationships between SLA and organizations working in the field of standardization, especially ANSC Z39.

Action by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management in December 1981 threatens serious erosion of the educational requirements and salaries for federal librarians and information specialists.[19] Any changes in these "Classification and Qualification Standards for Federal Library Information Positions" would affect not only federal information personnel, but may also be felt by special libraries in the private as well as other public sectors.

Given the rapid changes in the information field, particularly technical advances, and the need for flexibility in profit-making organizations so that they can respond to changes in the marketplace and in the economy, it is unlikely that comprehensive standards of performance

and service will ever be developed for business and industrial libraries. However, we can continue to write about and describe the successful ones.

The lack of standardization pertains only to the internal operation of the organizations. Special libraries in the profit sector are increasingly aware of the need for external standardization so that they can interface with other libraries, particularly through networks. Investigations by the NCLIS/SLA Task Force have revealed widespread participation for libraries in profit-making organizations throughout OCLC and related and similar networks.[20] Certainly, the lack of comprehensive performance standards has not been a hindrance to libraries in the profit sector in taking active and leading roles in the profession.

References

1. Cowgill, Logan O., and Havlik, Robert J. "Standards for Special Libraries." *Library Trends* 21(Oct. 1972):249-60.

2. *See* Markuson, Barbara E., and Woolls, Blanche, eds. *Critical Issues in Cooperative Library Development-Networks*. Indianapolis: Indiana Department of Public Instruction, Division of Instructional Media, 1979, p. 7.

3. Dodd to NCLIS/SLA Task Force, personal communication, 14 Jan. 1981.

4. Special Libraries Association. *Special Libraries Directory: Institutions Where SLA Members Are Employed*. New York: SLA, 1977.

5. Rodriguez to NCLIS/SLA Task Force, personal communication, 14 Jan. 1981.

6. Strable, Edward G. "The Relationship and Involvement of the Special Library with the National Program: Paper of Amplification" (Paper presented to NCLIS, 1974), p. 2. ED 100 389.

7. "Special Libraries Association Personnel Survey, 1959." *Special Libraries* 51(March 1960):133-57; "A Study of 1967 Annual Salaries of Members of the Special Libraries Association." *Special Libraries* 58(April 1967):217-54; "SLA Salary Survey, 1970." *Special Libraries* 61(July/Aug. 1970):333-48; "SLA Salary Survey, 1973." *Special Libraries* 64(Dec. 1973):594-628; "SLA Salary Survey, 1976." *Special Libraries* 67(Dec. 1976):597-624; and "SLA Salary Survey, 1979." *Special Libraries* 70(Dec. 1979):559-89.

8. "SLA Salary Survey, 1979," p. 559.

9. "SLA 1981 Salary Survey Update." *Special Libraries* 72(Oct. 1981):399.

10. Ansley to Dodd, personal communication, Jan. 1982.

11. Special Libraries Association. *Employment Opportunities*. Nov. 1981, p. [1].

12. _____ . Board of Directors. "Minutes, Open Sessions, 6-7 June 1980." Unpublished.

13. Cowgill and Havlik, "Standards for Special Libraries," p. 254.

14. "Objectives and Standards for Special Libraires." *Special Libraries* 55(Dec. 1964):672-80.

15. *See* Cowgill, Logan O. "Reports of Standing Committees 1971/72, Standards." *Special Libraries* 63(Sept. 1972):428-29.

16. *See*: O'Hara, Fred J. "Reports of Standing Committees 1973/74." *Special Libraries* 65(Aug. 1974):393-94; _____ . "Reports of Standing Committees 1974/75." *Special Libraries* 66(Sept. 1975):481; Cosgrove, Zoe L. "Reports of Standing Committees 1975/76." *Special Libraries* 67(Sept. 1976):472; _____ . "Reports of Standing Committees 1975/76: Standards and Statistics." *Special Libraries* 68(Sept. 1977):354; Kennedy,

Scott. "Reports of Standing Committees 1977/78: Standards and Statistics." *Special Libraries* 69(Sept. 1978):393-94; Linder, LeRoy H. "Reports of Standing Committees 1978/79: Standards." *Special Libraries* 70(Sept. 1979):432; _____. "Reports of Standing Committees 1979/80: Standards." *Special Libraries* 71(Sept. 1980):442; and Grosch, Audrey N. "Reports of Standing Committees 1980/81: Standards," p. 46. In *SLA Annual Report, 1980-81*. New York: SLA, 1982.

17. *See*: Kennedy, Scott. "Reports of Standing Committees 1978/79: Statistics." *Special Libraries* 70(Sept. 1979):432-33; _____. "Reports of Standing Committees 1979/80: Statistics." *Special Libraries* 71(Sept. 1980):442-43; and Ansley, Beth G. "Reports of Standing Committees 1980/81: Statistics," p. 47. In *SLA Annual Report, 1980-81*.

18. Special Libraries Association. Board of Directors. "Minutes, Open Sessions, 29-30 October 1981." Unpublished.

19. *See*: "Proposed Classification and Qualification Standards for Federal Library/Information Positions." *ALA Washington Newsletter* 33(21 Dec. 1981):Attachment 1; and "Proposed Federal Standards Devalue Library Education." *American Libraries* 13(Feb. 1982):134.

20. Robinson, Barbara M., and Berger, Patricia W., eds. *Final Report of the NCLIS/SLA Task Force on the Role of the Special Library in Nationwide Networks and Cooperative Programs*. New York: Special Libraries Association, 1982.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Standards for the Visually and Hearing Impaired

STEPHEN PRINE
KIETH C. WRIGHT

NINETEEN EIGHTY-ONE MARKS THE FIFTIETH anniversary of the Library of Congress network which provides service to blind citizens of the United States. This service has changed a great deal since it began in 1931; the services offered have been expanded and the eligible population has increased to approximately 1.4 percent of the total population. Provision of library service to this group and the development of standards for the libraries providing this service will be reviewed in the first part of this article. The second part of the article will discuss the development of guidelines for libraries serving the deaf and hard of hearing.

STANDARDS FOR THE BLIND AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED

Library service for the blind in the United States began during the nineteenth century when a few progressive public libraries and schools for the blind began to build collections of embossed (brailled) books. The public libraries were primarily located in metropolitan areas and in schools for the blind which had a captive audience. Content of the libraries' collections depended upon space and the particular code in which the books were embossed.

Stephen Prine is Director of Library Services for the Handicapped, South Carolina State Library, Columbia; and Kieth C. Wright is Chairman, Department of Library Science/Educational Technology, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

> In 1928, the American Library Association asked the American Foundation for the Blind to make a study of the library needs of blind people and how they were being met. This study showed that:
>
> 1. Some blind persons were borrowing books from several libraries.
> 2. Less than 10,000 blind people in the United States were making use of any library.
> 3. Libraries were having a difficult time obtaining embossed books because there were so few sources of supply....
>
> The American Foundation for the Blind, with the support of the American Library Association, recommended that the federal government undertake to supply free books for the blind to a [designated group] of geographically well-distributed libraries, on condition that these libraries circulate the books to readers in the assigned zones... whether or not these zones included an area larger than the taxing district maintaining the library.
>
> This recommendation resulted in the passage of the Pratt-Smoot Bill, which was signed into law by President Hoover on March 3, 1931.[1]

This law mandated that the Librarian of Congress:

> provide books...for the use of the adult blind residents of the United States, including the several States, Territories, insular possessions, and the District of Columbia.
>
> The Librarian of Congress may arrange with such libraries as he may judge appropriate to serve as local or regional centers for the circulation of such books, under such conditions and regulations as he may prescribe. In the lending of such books, preference shall at all times be given to the needs of blind persons who have been honorably discharged from the United States military or naval service.[2]

This law was amended by an "Act of March 4, 1933...[which] amended section 1 by adding after the word 'books' the following 'published either in raised characters, on sound-reproduction records, or in any other form.' "[3] Initially eighteen libraries were designated as regional libraries for the blind. This network of regional libraries, with the Library of Congress as a central point for the production of books in embossed and recorded formats, still exists today.

From its beginning, this network was cooperative in nature. The Library of Congress provided regional libraries with books and equipment. The regional libraries' parent organizations assumed responsibilities for staffing ongoing operations. All books, embossed and recorded, were mailed free to and from readers under a 1904 law which provided free mailing privileges for blind individuals. Throughout the 1930s, talking-book machines were provided as a WPA (Work Projects Administration) project.

The recorded books were produced on a specially developed long-playing disc which played at 33⅓rpm. Familiar to everyone today, the 33⅓rpm record was originally designed by the American Foundation for the Blind for the purpose of recording books for the blind. Throughout the history of this service, publishers and authors have generously granted permission for their works to be recorded and/or brailled, and, in some cases, have even participated in the recording.

The Pratt-Smoot Act specified that books be provided for the adult blind. In 1952 this act was amended by deleting the word *adult*, which made juvenile blind eligible for service. In 1966 the act was again amended: "Public Law 89-522 extended books-for-the-blind service to all persons who are unable to read conventional printed materials because of physical or visual limitations."[4]

In the late 1960s, technological advances began affecting library service for the blind and physically handicapped more agressively. For instance, a number of books had been produced on open-reel tape. This format proved unsuitable for a variety of reasons, but it did lead the way to the use of audiocassettes. Production of books on cassettes by the Library of Congress greatly expanded service capabilities of regional libraries. If a network library obtained tape duplication equipment, it could produce additional copies of a cassette book from a master tape to meet reader needs. With recording studios, the network libraries could produce books and magazines of local or regional interest read by volunteers.

At the same time, this library network was expanding and decentralizing. The concept of subregionalization was embraced by a large segment of the network. A subregional library is "a department or unit of a public library which provides services...[to] residents of a specified area of the regional library's total service area."[5] The subregional library has a much smaller collection and depends on the regional library for backup support for books, equipment and, in some cases, recordkeeping. There are now 56 regional and 102 subregional libraries in the United States.

In the 1970s the Library of Congress contracted for the establishment of multistate centers (MSC). Each MSC (there are now four) serves as a resource point for books, equipment and supplies for the regional libraries within its service-specified area. In the 1970s, the number of readers increased so dramatically throughout the country that many regional libraries began looking for ways to improve their service. The need for automation of circulation, machine inventory and periodical holdings has been felt and, wherever possible, implemented by an ever-growing segment of the network.

It is against this historical background of service development that the development of standards for library service should be viewed. The period between 1956 and 1976 saw the first major study of libraries serving the blind. From this study general simplified standards were developed which gave way to the standards formulated in the Commission on Standards and Accreditation of Services for the Blind (COMSTAC) Report. These standards were replaced by "guidelines" developed by LC's Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, now the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (NLS).

The first comprehensive attempt to survey the network and identify service problems and goals was the *Survey of Library Service for the Blind 1956* by Francis R. St. John, conducted under the auspices of the American Foundation for the Blind (AFB), with the encouragement of the Library of Congress. Robert Barnett, executive director of AFB, outlined the need for this study in a letter written to St. John:

> The purpose of this study of library services for blind persons is to assess the administrative and professional effectiveness of the special library facilities and programs established to serve blind individuals. A basic corollary to this purpose is the ongoing objective of improving services for blind persons. To achieve these objectives it is planned to:
>
> 1. Survey the twenty-eight libraries responsible for the distribution of braille and talking books provided by the federal government. The survey will involve a qualitative and quantitative evaluation of both the professional and administrative aspects of these libraries.
> 2. Survey the more than fifty agencies and organizations currently responsible for the distribution and maintenance of talking book machines.[6]

Two other objectives, that of surveying the blind themselves to ascertain their needs, and the development of an "authoritative statement of principles and standards [which can be used] 'to measure and advance the professional level of library services for blind persons,' "[7] were not addressed by the St. John study, but were left for future consideration. The Library of Congress's NLS has followed through with these objectives by providing funding for a reader survey and the standards. The latter was published by the ALA in 1979, and the former was conducted and published by the American Foundation for the Blind in the same year.[8]

The St. John survey, published in 1957, included not only results and recommendations, but attempted to draw a complete picture of the network by including a history of library service for the blind and a

section on organization patterns. Recommendations were made in the following areas: finance; organization; staffing; physical conditions (of books, equipment, and libraries); records; book selection; communication; technical problems; and publicity. The survey also made recommendations for future study needed in the following areas: books for blind children, book selection, standards, and research. The two major conclusions drawn from this survey were that: (1) "The needs of blind readers and their best interests be the factors to be weighed most heavily in making decisions in respect to library service for the blind"; and (2) "Library service is a skilled and professional service. Those who are blind should have service at least as competent as service for the sighted."[9] The recommendations in the conclusions of the St. John survey formed the basis for the standards and guidelines which followed.

In 1961, "Standards for Regional Libraries for the Blind" was prepared by the Library of Congress, Division for the Blind (now NLS), in cooperation with the ALA Round Table on Library Service to the Blind. These standards were prescriptive in nature, and minimally met the recommendations of the St. John survey to "develop an authoritative statement of principles and standards."[10] These standards did, however, expand St. John's conclusions with the following philosophical statement: "A regional library for the blind is essentially a public library for the legally blind person residing in the geographical area it serves. It should also be a source of basic information for all persons living in that area on the subjects of blindness and services available to blind persons."[11]

In 1966, ALA's Public Libraries Division incorporated the following statement into its standards: "It is to be expressly understood that each standard in this document applies to all ages and groups, and that a standard is not achieved if its provisions are met for one part of the population but not for another."[12] State library standards adopted by the American Association of State Libraries (AASL) in July 1963 included the statement: "Resources available within or near each state shall include a full range of reading materials for the blind and visually handicapped."[13]

In 1964, the American Foundation for the Blind (AFB) created the Commission on Standards and Accreditation of Services for the Blind. Financed by AFB, the commission maintained autonomy in procedures and policy-making. The two major accomplishments of the commission were: (1) the formulation of standards for agencies serving the blind and visually handicapped, which were published in 1966 as *The COM-*

STAC Report: Standards for Strengthened Services;[14] and (2) the designation of a continuous entity which would be responsible for administering a method of accountability based on the standards.

ALA's Library Administration Division adopted the COMSTAC standards in July 1966, which were published in 1967 as *Standards for Library Services for the Blind and Visually Handicapped*. Eric Moon wrote: "If [these standards find] sufficient enthusiastic support at all levels, [they] can do much to remove another group from the ranks of the 'under-privileged' library users."[15]

Unfortunately, these standards did not receive "sufficient support" from the network. It may be, as Donald John Weber, director of the Florida Regional Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, suggested, "when these standards' quantitative elements were applied, most libraries found them deficient since their standards were so idealistic that their application was unpracticable."[16] Or, as Katherine Prescott (former Regional Librarian of the Cleveland Regional Library, and chair of the ALA subcommittee writing the standards for the blind and physically handicapped) succinctly put it:

> In [1966, the same year ALA adopted the COMSTAC library standards], the U.S. Congress passed the momentous Public Law 80-522 which extended the Library of Congress "books for the blind" program to physically handicapped persons unable to use conventional print....[This] introduced important factors for change, a new readership with the doubling of potential users, and dramatically accelerated growth which in turn generated a trend toward decentralization in service and administration. The climate in which the service operates [had] also changed greatly since 1966, with the rising expectations of users and their increasing determination to participate as full equals in shaping the structure of [library] services to meet their requirements.[17]

By the early 1970s the National Accreditation Council (NAC) of agencies serving the blind and visually handicapped, formerly COMSTAC, found itself in conflict with the National Federation of the Blind. As a result, ALA, because of its formal association with NAC, became embroiled in the conflict. Because of this ongoing problem, in 1973 "the ALA Round Table on Library Services to the Blind passed a resolution for new standards that would recognize and be responsive to" the blind and physically handicapped library situation.[18] In 1975, at the ALA Annual Conference in San Francisco, the minutes of the Board of Directors of the Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division (HRLSD) further defined the controversy:

A resolution recommending that ALA withdraw its membership from NAC will be presented for discussion. It is the feeling of at least some members of the section that NAC as an accrediting agency for blind rehabilitation agencies is not the best agency to develop standards for library service to blind and physically handicapped persons. It is further the feeling that NAC is involved in a power struggle with the National Federation of the Blind and that it is inappropriate for ALA, HRLSD and the regional libraries for the blind and physically handicapped to become involved in this controversy.[19]

In July 1975, the following two resolutions were passed by the Library Services for the Blind and Physically Handicapped Section of HRLSD. Both were forwarded to the HRLSD Executive Board, and the latter resolution was submitted to the ALA Council at the 1976 Midwinter meeting.

WHEREAS, the primary concern of the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped is the accreditation of rehabilitative and social service programs for the blind and visually impaired, and

WHEREAS, the current 1966 standards for library service are designed for special service agencies for the blind and are outdated and inapplicable to public libraries in general, and

WHEREAS, NAC regularly issues publicity indicating that ALA is an affiliate and supporter of NAC, and

WHEREAS, the American Library Association believes that *all* handicapped persons are entitled to integrated library service at *all* levels (state, regional, local),

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the American Library Association disassociate itself from the National Accreditation Council and formulate standards of library service for all handicapped persons and that the National Accreditation Council be informed of this action by the appropriate ALA official.

WHEREAS, the present Standards for Library Services for the Blind and Visually Handicapped, which were formulated by the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped and adopted by ALA in 1966, are not relevant to library services as being provided today, and

WHEREAS, said standards emphasize centralized services, while the trend is toward decentralization and provision of local library service to all handicapped individuals, and

WHEREAS, said standards are too limited in scope, applying only to library services for the blind and visually impaired, totally excluding service to over 80 percent of the handicapped—those with physical disabilities, and

> WHEREAS, continued utilization and reliance upon the 1966 standards is a disservice to the library community,
>
> THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Standards for Library Services for the Blind and Visually Handicapped, adopted by the Library Administration Division of ALA on July 14, 1966, be declared obsolete, and that continued distribution of said standards by ALA be discontinued.[20]

In 1976, network libraries serving the blind and physically handicapped were again without standards. At this point LC's Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (DBPH) did two things. First, it issued its *Guidelines for Regional Libraries.* These guidelines were prepared with input from the user community and network librarians. The general philosophy of these guidelines follows:

> Reading occupies a significant place in our lives today. Reading for educational, vocational, informational, and recreational purposes begins in the early years of life, when a parent reads to his child, and continues through the senior citizen years. In a complex, rapidly changing environment, our understanding of the present, its relationship to the past, and what the future may hold, can be enriched through the use of books, magazines, and a variety of other information and media resources. The principal organization committed to the acquisition, arrangement, and dissemination of this material and information is the public library. The needs of the blind and handicapped reader are no different from those of other citizens. Differences may exist in the kinds of media and in the methods used for dissemination, but the range of subjects covered and the uses to which the material is put are the same.[21]

At the same time, DBPH followed through on the St. John survey recommendation for "authoritative standards" by beginning formal negotiations with ALA to expedite new standards for libraries serving the blind and physically handicapped.

In September 1977, a contract was signed by Robert Wedgeworth, Executive Director of ALA, and Frank Kurt Cylke, chief of LC's DBPH. DBPH agreed to subsidize the writing of the standards, provided they were completed within a two-year period. The contract required ALA: "to formulate the standards for library services to the blind and physically handicapped which are provided through the network administered by the Library of Congress, Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, under Public Law 89-522. Specifically the standards shall cover services at the national, multistate, regional, subregional, and machine agency levels."[22] In addition, this contract outlined future objectives encouraging ALA:

> to formulate the standards for library services to the blind and physically handicapped which are provided by state, public, school (elementary and secondary), academic (post-secondary), and institutional (hospital, nursing homes, correctional facilities, etc.) libraries. Also included shall be standards for organizations and agencies which are developing and maintaining print collections about visual physical handicaps.[23]

With these objectives and time frame in mind, HRLSD (now the Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies/ASCLA) appointed a committee of eight individuals to write the standards. Each member of the committee was assigned a section to develop. The committee was well chosen in that it included individuals with extensive backgrounds in library services to the handicapped, as well as representatives from other agencies serving the handicapped. Because of their dedication and hard work, in approximately six months the committee released a draft entitled *March 1978 Preliminary Draft Standards of Services for the Library of Congress Network of Libraries for the Blind and Physically Handicapped*. This draft was made available in braille, disc and print to the LC network, consumer organizations, and to all ALA division presidents and executive secretaries.

At the ALA Annual Conference in Chicago in June 1978, the program of the Library Services for the Blind and Physically Handicapped Section (LSBPHS) consisted of a forum on the proposed standards. The meeting was attended by approximately 250 librarians and consumers. As a result of the feedback from the forum and written comments, the committee completely rewrote portions of the draft standards document.

At this same conference, the LSBPHS membership voted that a revised draft of the standards should be provided to all members, and that a mail vote approving or disapproving the standards be effected before the 1979 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Washington, D.C. A revised draft was developed and mailed to the LSBPHS membership and was overwhelmingly approved by voting members. This revised draft was also presented as an agenda topic at the National Conference of Librarians for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, held in Washington, D.C., in October 1978. During the ALA Midwinter Meeting in 1979, the LSBPHS Executive Committee approved the proposed standards, as did the ASCLA Standards Review Committee, the ASCLA Board of Directors, and the ALA Standards Review Committee. These standards were published by ALA late in 1979, and the Library of Congress network finally had "authoritative standards."

The committee which wrote the 1977 standards was well aware that all relevant topics could not be included in these standards, and that the passage of time would change their focus. Therefore, under section 3.8 on future considerations, the following recommendations were included:

> The ASCLA Standards for Library Service to the Blind and Physically Handicapped Subcommittee urges the immediate appointment by the ASCLA Board of Directors of a new committee to monitor the implementation of these standards with the goal of formulating new standards within five years. The charge to this committee should include a mechanism for user participation initially and periodically throughout the phases of standards formulation; one method would be an advisory council of users to work with the ASCLA committee.
>
> The present subcommittee suggests that the new committee undertake the following tasks:
>
> 1. Cooperation with the LC/NLS Network of Libraries for the Blind and Physically Handicapped in activities such as:
>   a. Testing the criteria used in the present standards; collecting factual data on costs, staffing patterns, space requirements, and production and duplication of library materials.
>   b. Research evaluating the present standards; relating criteria to program activities as well as to gross statistics such as circulation, users registered, and staff.
>   c. Documentation of user and network staff participation in planning and policy determination.
> 2. Investigation and evaluation of new developments in:
>   a. Services such as the radio reading service.
>   b. Technical advances such as automated circulation systems.
>   c. Impact of electronic reading aids.
>   d. Effect of new legislation on the use by blind and physically handicapped users of the resources in various types of libraries not linked formally in the LC/NLS Network of Libraries for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.[24]

In 1980 a subcommittee was appointed by ASCLA, which currently meets at ALA midwinter and annual conferences for the purposes of monitoring the implementation of these standards and receiving comments and suggestions which will be turned over to a committee with the responsibility of revising the standards.

At the 1980 National Conference of Librarians for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, the NLS/BPH announced it would be soliciting proposals for a two-year study of the implementation of the ALA standards by the network. Specifically, the contract called for the following:

> a. to develop appropriate fact gathering tools, and a reporting format for consistent and accurate evaluation of NLS and network

libraries in relation to the ALA Standards of Service...;

b. to identify an advisory group to review the products of paragraph (a); to convene the group, solicit comments and prepare a typed statement of the plan acceptable to all;

c. to implement the plan developed (a and b) by visiting NLS, four multistate centers, and the regional libraries (currently fifty-six) over no more than a two-year period, preparing reports on each agency, and preparing a consolidated report at the end of the period to reflect the overall status of NLS, the MSC, and the network when compared with the Standards;

d. to develop an agreement instrument which can be used between network libraries and NLS...;

e. to prepare a plan for ongoing monitoring of the Standards after the contract expires.[25]

In December 1980, Battelle Memorial Laboratories of Columbus, Ohio, was awarded the contract for the study. In 1981 Battelle appointed an advisory committee consisting of four representatives from the NLS network and representatives from consumer organizations and the academic community.

The initial meeting of the Battelle Standards Advisory Committee was held February 1981 at NLS in Washington, D.C. Prior to the meeting, Battelle had prepared a questionnaire based on the standards. The advisory committee reviewed the questionnaire and made suggestions. The questionnaire was finalized and distributed to NLS, the regional libraries, and the multistate centers and their administering agencies. The questionnaire contained five parts and was designed to allow libraries to show whether or not they met individual standards (totally or in part), as well as whether, in their opinion, they were providing quality if they did not meet the individual standard. The questionnaires were received by the network libraries in the summer of 1981.

At the request of the ASCLA standards subcommittee on handicapped standards, a special section was added to the questionnaire to solicit network librarians' opinions of the standards. This section is being returned unsigned and will be turned over to the ASCLA Standards Subcommittee on Library Services to the Blind and Physically Handicapped as feedback for future revision of the standards.

The results will be statistically compiled, grouping libraries according to several criteria, such as size, budget and circulation. The results will show which standards the network is meeting, and which standards need to be met: "The NLS Network participation in this project is a pioneering effort. Never before has a comprehensive review of libraries and their relations to a set of standards been attempted at the national level."[26]

Sadly, the development of standards for library services to blind and physically handicapped individuals which are provided by public schools and by academic and institutional libraries has not proceeded at the same pace. In 1979 an ASCLA interest group formed to work with other ALA divisions to encourage integration of standards for the handicapped into their overall standards. To date there has been little interest from the other divisions. It is hoped that by the time the next *Library Trends* issue on standards is published, other divisions' standards will reflect sections on services to the blind and physically handicapped.

STANDARDS FOR THE DEAF AND HEARING IMPAIRED

Through the work of the Library Services to the Deaf Section of ASCLA (and its predecessor, the ad hoc Committee on Services to the Deaf) and numerous individuals, library services for deaf and hearing impaired patrons came to national attention in the latter half of the 1970s. When this author became librarian of Gallaudet College in 1972, there was a need to explore ways in which public libraries could serve deaf patrons. Gallaudet College sponsored a regional workshop on such services, and later a national workshop, with invitations extended to state library agencies, state deaf associations and public libraries. Two early influential papers need to be cited: Lee Putnam's "Information Needs of Hearing Impaired People,"[27] and Alice Hagemeyer's *Deaf Awareness Handbook for Public Libraries.*[28] Since 1976 these publications, as well as ALA preconferences and program sections (such as the ASCLA's Library Services to the Deaf Section and the Reference and Adult Services Division 1979 ALA program, "Working with Deaf Adults"), have increased awareness of the possibilities for services to deaf patrons, and they illustrate types of programs and services which have been tried.

As more and more libraries initiated services to deaf patrons, the need changed from informal sharing of programs and services that worked to the need to be able to evaluate these services on the basis of some standards. In 1978-79, the ASCLA Board appointed an Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Standards for Library Services to the Deaf. Under the chairmanship of Lethene Parks, this subcommittee drew on the resources of the membership of the Library Services to the Deaf Section of ASCLA and input from libraries which had program experience with deaf patrons.

Over a period of two years, this subcommittee worked on developing *Guidelines for Public Library Service to Deaf and Hard of Hearing Persons.*[29] Although still in draft form, the guidelines have been reviewed by the Library Services to the Deaf Section Executive Committee, and will be referred to the appropriate committees in ASCLA and the Public Library Division of ALA. These draft guidelines provide our best present source for program evaluation. The guidelines are divided into five sections: (1) introduction, (2) communication, (3) resources, (4) publicity and program, and (5) participation and staffing.

The introduction underscores the wide variety of hearing losses and of means of communication used by those who are deaf, as well as the legislative mandate to ensure that all these groups have reasonable access to all of the services of the public library.

The guidelines on communication recognize that communication with the deaf patron requires a consciousness of several facts:

1. For many deaf people English is a second language and sign language is their primary means of communication, so that public programs in the library will need sign-language interpretation.
2. Much communication for the deaf patron needs to be focused on the visual medium. Library signs should use the international symbol code as well as printed English. Video (especially with the use of closed-caption decoder) is another important information format for deaf patrons. Special attention needs to be paid to the lighting of meeting rooms so that deaf persons can see the interpreter or otherwise more easily read lips. All important signals (fire alarms, elevator, etc.) should be visual as well as auditory. In any emergency, the library staff should check to see that deaf and hard-of-hearing persons have received the alarm.
3. Auditory aids will help many hard-of-hearing persons who want to use listening stations or other audio formats. Audio equipment and at least one telephone should be amplified to a level where hard-of-hearing people can utilize them.
4. Deaf persons can make use of the telephone by means of telecommunication devices for the deaf (TDD), and libraries should have at least one such device for references, information and referral service. Deaf patrons should be able to use the library TDD to contact other TDD locations.

The guidelines on resources emphasize that deaf persons have the same information needs as other people. English reading skills vary greatly among these patrons, and resources which are high interest/low vocabulary, heavily illustrated, or in film or video format will be useful.

Up-to-date resources which give information on deafness (medical, legal, educational, cultural, biographical) for all age levels should be collected and displayed by libraries. The library's information and referral file should provide information on persons and organizations who provide services for deaf persons.

The guidelines on publicity and programs urge inclusion of deaf and hard-of-hearing persons in all programs, services or classes of the library through publicity among local and state organizations serving the deaf and hard-of-hearing. Any special services (e.g., interpreters), resources or equipment (TDD, etc.) should be promoted by special publications and announcements. Library programs or promotions on local television should be captioned or interpreted for deaf people. Library film programs can regularly include unnarrated or captioned films.

The guidelines on participation and staffing remind libraries that deaf and hard-of-hearing patrons should be represented on advisory boards, trustees and voluntary groups related to the library. Any special programs for deaf persons should be cooperatively planned with those persons. Equal opportunity and affirmative action will be promoted as library staff members are trained to communicate with deaf persons and deaf or hard-of-hearing persons are considered for employment in the library.

Although still in its beginning phase, library services to deaf and hard-of-hearing persons have developed an amazing variety and depth of services and programs. The Library Services for the Deaf Section of ASCLA has cooperated with other ALA divisions and with deaf organizations, such as the National Association of the Deaf,[30] to develop guidelines for such services and programs.

CONCLUSION

Twenty-three years after St. John's survey, ALA has approved *Standards of Service for the Library of Congress Network of Libraries for the Blind and Physically Handicapped*. While these are "benchmark" standards, they are not carved in stone. The committee which wrote these standards recommended a revision within five years. In the two years since approval, some standards have already become obsolete, and the need to address additional areas has become evident. These standards will be revised in 1985-86 based on input obtained from the LC network.

Visually and Hearing Impaired

Standards for service to the deaf and hard-of-hearing are beginning to emerge, as more and more libraries and organizations of deaf persons seek to communicate the library's potential to the deaf community. A major first step was taken with the publication of "Techniques for Library Service to the Deaf and Hard of Hearing."[31] ASCLA will continue to encourage other ALA divisions to include library service to the handicapped in their existing standards, but resistance will not fade until service to the handicapped is perceived as more than simply the removal of architectural barriers.

References

1. St. John, Francis R. *Survey of Library Service for the Blind 1956*. New York: American Foundation for the Blind, 1957, pp. 9-10.
2. *U.S. Code*, Title 2, §135a-b. Included *in* St. John, *Survey*, App. C, pp. 122-23.
3. St. John, *Survey*, p. 122.
4. Library of Congress. Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. *Manual for Regional Libraries*. Washington, D.C.: 1973, II, p. 4.
5. ALA Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies. *Standards of Service for the Library of Congress Network of Libraries for the Blind and Physically Handicapped*. Chicago: ALA, 1979, p. 14.
6. St. John, *Survey*, p. 2.
7. Ibid., p. 3.
8. Berkowitz, Marvin, et al. *Reading with Print Limitations*. New York: American Foundation for the Blind, 1979.
9. St. John, *Survey*, p. 98.
10. Ibid., p. 3.
11. Library of Congress. Division for the Blind. "Standards for Regional Libraries for the Blind." Mimeographed. Washington, D.C.: LC, Division for the Blind, 1961.
12. ALA Public Libraries Division. Coordinating Committee on Review of Public Library Standards. *Public Library Service: A Guide to Evaluation, With Minimum Standards*. Chicago: ALA, 1966, p. 5.
13. ALA American Association of State Libraries. Survey and Standards Committee. *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level*. Chicago: ALA, 1963, p. 11.
14. Commission on Standards and Accreditation of Services for the Blind. *The COMSTAC Report: Standards for Strengthened Services*. New York: COMSTAC, 1966.
15. ALA Library Administration Division. *Standards for Library Services for the Blind and Visually Handicapped*. Chicago: ALA, 1967, p. 9.
16. Weber, Donald J. "Standards for Library Services to the Handicapped." *Dikta* 3(Spring 1978):4.
17. ALA Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division. Ad Hoc Committee to Review Standards for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. "Standards of Service for the Library of Congress Network of Libraries for the Blind and Physically Handicapped: Preliminary Draft, March 1978." Mimeographed. Chicago, ALA, 1978, pp. 3-4.
18. Ibid., p. 4.
19. ALA Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division. Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting, 2d Sess., 1 July 1975, at San Francisco, p. 5.
20. *See* ibid.

21. Library of Congress. Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. *Guidelines for Regional Libraries*. Washington, D.C.: LC, 1976, III, C, p. 2.

22. ALA Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division. Blind and Physically Handicapped Section. *A Contract to Formulate the Standards for Library Services to the Blind and Physically Handicapped*. Chicago: ALA, 1977, p. 1.

23. Ibid.

24. ASCLA, *Standards for the LC Network*, pp. 15-16.

25. Library of Congress. National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. "Network Bulletin #684." 8 Sept. 1980, p. 1.

26. _____ . "Network Bulletin #721," 17 Dec. 1980, p. 1.

27. Putnam, Lee. "Information Needs of Hearing Impaired People." *HRLSD Journal* 2(Spring 1976):2-14.

28. Hagemeyer, Alice. *Deaf Awareness Handbook for Public Libraries*. Washington, D.C.: District of Columbia Public Library, 1975. *See also*, for expanded and updated version, ASCLA Subcommittee on Standards for Library Service to the Deaf. "Techniques for Library Service to the Deaf and Hard of Hearing." *Interface* 4(Fall 1981):2-3.

29. ASCLA Subcommittee on Standards for Library Services to the Deaf. *Guidelines for Public Library Service to Deaf and Hard of Hearing Persons*. Chicago: ALA, forthcoming.

30. The National Association of the Deaf Bookstore (814 Thayer Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20910) has information on the "Friends of Libraries for Deaf Action" (a section of the NAD) and other helpful materials, including the Red Notebook, which provides up-to-date information on deafness, services for the deaf and library services for them.

31. ASCLA Subcommittee, "Techniques."

Standards for Library Services to People in Institutions

RICHARD T. MILLER, JR.

ANY AUTHOR WHO PROPOSES to examine in one article the topic of standards for institutional library services must admit at the start that nothing more than an overview can be offered. The diversity of the institutions from state to state, changes in how society at large views these institutions and their residents, and differing approaches by state library agencies—these and other factors militate against any simple description of library standards related to institutional libraries.

This article will begin with a review of the various types of institutions which exist. Next it will consider some of the national, state and local standards which exist for each type of institution, as well as cover guidelines or goals which are sometimes used in lieu of standards. In addition, standards used by state library agencies in their institutional library planning will be discussed. A consideration of the particular problems associated with standardization of standards in institutions will follow. Finally, observations will be made about some of the positive and negative aspects of current standards, and conclusions will be drawn concerning the effective use of standards in the institutional library setting.

Growing Diversity

Many of us can remember from our childhood the various names we had for institutions where "abnormal" people were placed—the "nut house," the "funny farm," the "pen." These institutions may have

Richard Miller is Projects Coordinator, Missouri State Library, Jefferson City.

been, along with their residents, the objects of our childish derision, but they were nearly invisible, often tucked away in remote, less populous areas. Their residential populations were large, and a person was either in the institution or not—there was no "halfway" about it.

Institutions today have gone through considerable changes. We no longer have just the mental hospital, the prison, the jail, but a profusion of types of institutions designed mainly to keep people who need institutional services as close as possible to the mainstream of society. Now we see, for example, sheltered workshops, group homes, halfway houses, juvenile detention centers, and pre-release facilities. And the populations of the large residential facilities, except for adult correctional institutions, have decreased considerably. These changes have been brought about partly through societal attempts to "humanize" treatment of its members who are not able or not willing to live in our society without some special care or treatment. But another factor leading to these modifications is purely economic—it is cheaper to feed, clothe, house, and care for a person the closer that person is to the mainstream of society. Thus, for example, a convicted felon who can function in a halfway house setting, working and paying taxes, costs society less than one in a maximum security institution. Similarly, a developmentally disabled person living in the family home or in a group home and working in a sheltered workshop costs society less than if the same person were living in a state-run institution.

These examples are given to illustrate the diversity of institutions as a reflection of the diversity of their clients. In any consideration of standards for library services to people in institutions, then, it is a foregone conclusion that such standards will need to take into account the variety of people served by these diverse institutions with their variety of library needs. We can no longer be content with providing westerns, mysteries and martial arts books to jails when prisoners are seeking free-world employment so that they can move into halfway houses. Just as the clients can no longer be "pigeonholed" so easily, neither can their library needs.

Current Institutional Library Standards

The following section will review some of the various national standards now in place for institutional library services. It does not pretend to be an exhaustive consideration of the topic. The arrangement will be by type of institution or resident. Some state or local standards or guidelines, sent in response to a request by the author, will also be

mentioned, especially if they represent significant departures from national standards.

Institutions for the Mentally Retarded/Developmentally Disabled

Until the publication of *Standards for Libraries at Institutions for the Mentally Retarded* by the American Library Association's Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies (ASCLA),[1] no detailed national standards existed for such library services. While the earlier standards of the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals went into some detail on staff library services for this type of institution as well as for other "hospital" settings, they had little more to say on the subject of resident library services other than that these services should be provided.[2] The ASCLA *Standards* themselves are comprehensive, covering the subjects of organization, function, materials selection, design and equipment, budget, and staff. They follow the format for standards developed by the American Library Association in its *ALA Standards Manual*, which will be discussed at some length later in this article.[3]

The standards, completed in June 1978 but delayed for various reasons, were "designed to describe an adequate library program for an average institution."[4] Statements appended to the standards offer some indication of the compromises which had to be reached as the standards committee attempted to pull together the varying points of view of both committee members and experts to whom the standards were submitted for comment: "There were those who thought the quantities were too high and those who thought they were too low. There were suggestions for things to add and for things to delete. In general, the Committee counted the 'votes' and adjusted the *Standards* to suit the majority."[5] This tug-and-pull of whether standards should be minima or "something to shoot for" seems to come up any time standards are written.

Prior to these ALA national standards, a number of states wrote standards of their own. South Dakota produced individualized standards, in addition to policies and procedures, for each one of its mental retardation institutions.

In Iowa and Missouri, the institutional consultants of the two state library agencies wrote joint interim standards for residential institutions for the mentally retarded.[6] While aimed specifically at institutions, they attempted to go beyond the residential institutions to which the ALA standards are limited. In their introduction, the authors noted that public library services to other institutions (such as group homes) or to mentally retarded individuals might be extrapolated from these standards.[7]

Mental Health Institutions

No national standards exist for library services in mental health institutions. Alan Engelbert, institutional consultant for the Missouri State Library, contacted all the state library agencies in September 1980 in preparation for writing standards for Missouri. He found that no state currently has such standards, and that most states which responded concurred that national standards would be helpful. A number of states did note, however, that they have standards, guidelines, goals, or objectives for the development of all types of institutional libraries. (This topic of standards within the state library agency, as opposed to those within the institutions themselves, will be discussed later.) In response to the author's inquiry, Pennsylvania sent Engelbert a draft copy of rather extensive guidelines for such service.[8]

Prior to the writing of the Missouri standards, the only document in the state which related to the need for library services (and this only indirectly) was a statement that mental health patients had the right of access to current newspapers and magazines. For working with the mental health institutions, the state library first used the ALA standards for health care institutions,[9] and later the ALA standards for institutions for the mentally retarded,[10] but neither one proved satisfactory. The new Missouri standards themselves borrow heavily from various national standards, and the format follows closely that of the ALA mental retardation standards. As do the latter standards, the Missouri standards for the mentally ill set forth in the introduction the purpose, objective, need, scope, audience, methodology, assumptions, and terminology.[11] The standards statements cover the role of the library; administration; staff; budget; materials; space, furniture and equipment; and services. According to the scope note, these standards, while intended for Missouri Department of Mental Health facilities for the mentally ill, "may also be used as a guide for providing library services to mentally ill individuals who are clientele of other facilities (e.g., nursing homes where mentally ill persons have been placed)."[12]

Institutions for Youthful Offenders

In 1975 the American Library Association and the American Correctional Association (ACA) jointly issued national standards entitled *Library Standards for Juvenile Correctional Institutions.*[13] The publication of these standards was nothing short of a major coup, because a nonlibrary organization joined with ALA to issue library standards. Anthony Travisono, ACA's executive director, in his preface to the standards, states that the document offers: "clearly defined concrete

standards which can serve as a guide in providing and maintaining adequate library facilities in juvenile institutions....In addition, these standards will provide for the recently established Commission on Accreditation for Corrections a firm basis for the evaluation of this specialized service to offenders."[14] (Unfortunately, a later attempt to issue standards jointly for adult correctional institutions bogged down when ACA decided to make changes in its accreditation process.) The juvenile standards themselves are quite similar in format to a number of other national standards mentioned in this article. In fact, they preceded most of these other standards, and served as a model for a number of them.

Two state standards should be mentioned here. The first of these, from California, has obviously used the national standards, but has rewritten parts of them, deleted, added, and modified them to make them locally applicable.[15] In correspondence transmitting these standards, Bonnie Crell, the coordinator of Library Services of the Youth Authority, noted that these standards were "being issued as Institutions and Camps Branch Standards."

Another example of an entity other than the state library agency promulgating standards was sent by Alden Moberg, former institutional consultant for the Oregon State Library. In that state, libraries for juvenile detention facilities (as well as the schools for the visually and hearing impaired) fall under media program standards for public schools.[16] In this situation there is no connection whatsoever to national institutional library standards.

Adult Correctional Institutions

No other area of institutional librarianship seems to have generated as much interest in standards as adult corrections. The publication in 1981 of *Library Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions* represented a culmination, and a disappointment of sorts, for the committee members who had worked many hours on these standards.[17] The disappointment was that these standards could not be published jointly by the ACA and the ALA, as the standards for juvenile correctional institutions had been. By the time these adult standards were ready, the ACA had decided upon a standardized approach and format of its own for all accreditation standards it issued. While these accreditation standards[18] refer to the ACA/ALA jointly developed standards, they are not nearly as detailed. Even more discouraging is the fact that, under the current ACA accreditation process, adequacy in another aspect of a correctional institution may be substituted for adequate library service. The

ACA/ALA Joint Committee, however, is continuing its work to strengthen the ACA library standards accreditation process.

Judging from the responses to this author's request for state and local standards and guidelines, many states have library standards for state-run adult correctional facilities even if standards exist for no other type of institution. Furthermore, standards for this type of institution seem more likely to be promulgated by a corrections-related entity rather than by a library-related one. In Texas, for example, the *Library Policy and Procedures Manual* of the Windham School District (the Department of Corrections independent school district) was prepared by the library staff and adopted by the Texas Board of Corrections.[19] This publication includes standards statements. Michigan and Florida both sent policy directives from their respective departments of corrections. Oregon sent sections of that state's administrative rules which apply to its corrections division. In all these, the standards are mixed in with policies and procedures, and are somewhat less detailed than national standards written by librarians. But they carry with them something not all national library standards do—the weight of approval by the governing entities of these correctional institutions.

Pennsylvania has recently developed guidelines based on the ACA Commission on Accreditation standards and on the ACA/ALA standards. These guidelines were produced by adult correctional librarians in that state.[20] Apparently, this group felt the need to use something other than the national standards. Perhaps they felt that guidelines, rather than standards, would be more acceptable to correctional administrators in their state.

Another aspect of correctional libraries which has received much attention is that of legal library services. In fact, it is often this part of library services which is of most interest to correctional institution administrators, for it is here that they are most likely to be involved in litigation. While the ALA national standards devote about two of the twelve pages of standards to legal library services,[21] correctional administrators apparently assign it more importance. The Florida Department of Corrections' directives, for example, devote three pages to library services in general and eight pages to law libraries.

While not standards, two publications are cited in standards regularly and should be noted here. These are the American Association of Law Libraries's *Recommended Collections for Prison and Other Institution Law Libraries,*[22] and the ACA's *Providing Legal Services for Prisoners.*[23]

Local correctional institutions present particular problems when attempts are made to standardize library services. The jurisdictions one

is dealing with are many and varied, and conditions in municipal or county jails vary greatly. Also, since many local correctional facilities depend upon a public library for service, the quality of public library service available and the level of service the library is willing to offer to the institution are factors which are difficult to control.

National standards have recently been issued by ASCLA for library services to local correctional facilities.[24] These standards should prove to be a good starting point for localities and states which currently have no library standards for jails. These ASCLA standards were based on exemplary standards from Oregon and Illinois.[25] In Illinois, for example, library services are part of that state's standards for county jails.[26] This is also true in California, where statements concerning library services appear in the minimum jail standards and in various documents for establishing and operating jails. While these are not as comprehensive as librarians in that state had wished, California at least has library standards in the statewide standards promulgated by the state's Board of Corrections. This is more than many states can claim.

Miscellaneous Institutions

While it is fairly easy to sort most institutions into the categories used previously, each state has institutions which are miscellaneous, usually one-of-a-kind facilities. In Missouri, the State Chest Hospital, State Veterans' Home and State Cancer Hospital fall into this category. Generally, *Standards for Library Services in Health Care Institutions* has been used when planning their services.[27] However, these standards are somewhat dated, and they offer more help on staff library services than on services for patients. Furthermore, they contain no quantitative standards. Since no other pertinent standards currently exist, it might be advisable to search elsewhere for help. For library services for an institution with an elderly population, for example, it might be feasible to use these health care standards in conjunction with publications which are not standards, such as *Equal Access,*[28] or "Guidelines for Library Services to an Aging Population."[29]

A Unique Case

The South Dakota approach to institutional libraries was mentioned briefly before, but needs further amplification. I found no other state library agency which had written individual standards specifically for each institution.

In a letter to the author dated June 29, 1981, institutional consultant Betty Siedschlaw states: "In the early 1970s it became apparent... that institutional libraries were operating in the state without any

guidelines or policies in a strictly 'do-the-best-you-can' attitude....In 1977 the Institutional Consultant began working on minimal standards for each of the institutions using the ALA/ACA *Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions* as a guide." She went on to point out that these standards were written because the national standards then in existence were unattainable for that state's institutions. Another unique element of South Dakota's standards is that they were presented to each institution before going into effect: "It was made clear to each director and librarian that the standards and policies could be adjusted by them if they did not agree with the consultant's opinion, or if a policy needed to be added or eliminated."[30]

State Library Agency Standards

Most state library agencies have quite clearly defined standards or guidelines for in-house operations. Even if there are no standards which directly apply to the operation of institutional libraries such as those reviewed earlier, state agency standards or guidelines often define, at least indirectly, what constitutes adequate institutional library services. This is usually accomplished by setting out minima or goals for the state library agency to attain in its service to these state-run institutional libraries. In many cases these standards-type statements are part of the state library agency's long-range plan under the federal Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA).

Guidelines in Hawaii, for example, include criteria for library services to the institutionalized which offer some specifics on recommended collection size and content, on services rendered, and on staffing. Arizona's long-range plan is even more detailed, with quite specific criteria for determining the adequacy of institutional libraries.[31] Florida's long-range program also lists detailed criteria for institutional libraries, and these criteria form the basis for goals and objectives to be achieved by the state library agency.

West Virginia's long-range plan and Delaware's policy statement concerning institutional libraries again both indicate what the state library agency will do about this particular type of library service. While some of the foregoing plans are not very clear on how initiation or improvement of institutional library services will be brought about, Connecticut's plan, by contrast, assigns personnel from its own staff to other departments which operate state institutions. It is the responsibility of each of these library supervisors to move the institutional libraries in the direction of meeting certain standards.

New Mexico provides a detailed series of statements which list the goal to be attained, the current conditions in the state, the objectives, the activities, and the evaluation measures. These statements, however, are intended for the state agency and not for the institutions themselves, although what the institutional library "shall" have or do is covered. New Jersey's institution planning guide is eclectic, incorporating goals and minimum requirements, philosophical statements, and parts of various national standards.

But no matter how varied these statements seem at first, they all appear to be derived from the first or revised edition of *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level.*[32] This seminal publication notes that a state library agency, as part of its service to state government, should have clear and official relationships with other state agencies responsible for institutional libraries.[33] Appendix II of this publication, entitled "The Relationship and Responsibilities of the State Library Agency to State Institutions,"[34] expands upon this responsibility.

There are differences between standards written for use by an institutional library itself and those written for a state library agency one step removed from the institutional library setting. Neither type can be said to be superior to the other. In fact, a combination of statements relating to each other—in the state library agency's long-range plan and in the institutional library's policies (and preferably also in the documents of the state agency responsible for the institution)—could help support the presence of library service.

Standardizing Standards for Institutions

Each state is unique, as are the individual institutons within that state. What can be observed from the documents sent by various states and institutions is that many places build in their own modifications even when they use national standards. Some states, such as Missouri, use all the national standards available for institutional libraries, but tell the institutions that the standards are something toward which to progress. Others take parts from various standards to produce their own. Still other states have managed to have pertinent statutes, rules and regulations, and so forth, passed to cover library needs. Using rules and regulations from nonlibrary sources (e.g., education standards) has proven effective in some institutions.

There is little standardization, then, of institutional library standards among the states and among the various types of institutions. Nevertheless, such standardization, at least on the national level, is

important because it provides a solid base upon which the states can plan their programs. The states or individual institutions might modify the national standards, but the latter still provide something toward which to move.

The American Library Association has done much to help produce "standardized" library standards issued under its imprimatur through its publication of its *ALA Standards Manual*. Granted, using this manual does slow down the standards-writing process, but it also guarantees some consistency from one set of standards to another. The manual does make one wonder, however, if this standardization is not more for the consumption of librarians than it is for others outside the profession. This is not to quibble with the manual, since it is especially useful in making certain that standards cover all areas as they are being written. However, those outside the profession—say, an administrator of a mental health institution—are not likely to be much affected one way or the other by some of the niceties called for.

The *ALA Standards Manual*, for example, distinguishes between a standard and a guideline. The former is defined as "a rule or model of quantity, quality, extent, level, or correctness, approved by a unit of ALA...and promulgated by the Association as a gauge by which the degree of attainment of official ALA Goals can be measured."[35] A guideline, on the other hand, is a "suggested level of performance or adequacy viewed by the ALA Standards Committee...as a desired direction of development, not having the force of an ALA Standard, nor the commitment of an evaluation by which judgments can be confirmed and evidence evaluated."[36] While these definitions certainly are clear, one wonders again if the distinctions so carefully drawn here are simply lost on anyone outside the profession, and whether the phrase "not having the force of an ALA Standard" is meaningful.

The Pros and Cons of Standards

The topic of library standards is always a controversial one. Despite efforts on the part of the American Library Association (e.g., the *ALA Standards Manual*), there probably will never be agreement on the purpose of standards. This is as true in institutional libraries as it is in other libraries.

Certainly, library standards do not lack for criticism. Meredith Bloss, in his article entitled "Research; and Standards for Library Service,"[37] criticizes current library standards at some length. The premise of his article is that there are few, if any, "library service standards [or

guidelines, or criteria] based upon solid research."[38] His contention is that "Research would be a welcome addition" to the usual methods for drawing up standards, which currently are simply the compilation of "batteries of statistics, and the 'wisdom of the seers.' "[39] The definition of *standards* in the *ALA Standards Manual* comes in for sharp criticism, especially the phrase: "An ALA Standard is intended as a criterion by which current judgments of value, quality, fitness, and correctness are confirmed."[40] The process of "confirming" judgments already decided upon earlier through the promulgation of standards certainly has little to do with a research approach.

Bloss argues that "service standards would be more creditable, particularly among 'non-library' authorities, if the standards were to be based upon solid research."[41] This is at best an arguable point. One has to wonder whether an institutional administrator would be any more likely to heed a standard based on research than on the judgment and experience of librarians, especially if that research is outside that administrator's field.

Bloss also questions the wisdom of the charge which was given to the ALA Committee on Standards. This charge states: "The development of standards should act as a powerful force for upgrading library services, resources, and facilities—the ultimate goal of the Association and this Committee."[42] Many librarians apparently feel that they can use ALA standards as a club to increase the funding for libraries. Bloss implies that librarians need to question the validity of this approach.

Lancaster, quoted in the Bloss article, contends that "library standards have a tendency to be guidelines rather than true enforceable standards of the type that govern engineering...operations."[43] Boyer, in this same article, is quoted as saying: "Leaders of many communities are no longer impressed by standards drawn up by 'outside' sources, no matter how reputable," and "minimum standards can be used in a 'coercive' way only if there is a sufficient *reward* for compliance."[44] Both these statements, however, fail to take into account the characteristics which are unique to the library, those which set it apart from other types of endeavors. It is most unlikely that measurement or evaluation of libraries can ever be based on standards such as those used in engineering, to use the example cited by Lancaster. The latter is based upon scientifically proven physical properties, such as stress factors and weight-bearing capacities. To compare libraries with engineering in this sense is absurd. It is also unlikely that libraries will ever have "coercive" standards with rewards for compliance high enough to bring about significant change based on this mode of operation. Change in

relation to library standards always comes back to how successfully librarians themselves are able to use the standards. "Whatever effect...library standards have must...come from persuasion."[45]

Much of the debate in the Bloss article probably seems no more than an academic exercise, especially to institutional librarians. The latter are more likely to be worried about whether or not their jobs will be retained than about the "fine tuning" of library standards. The librarians responding to the author's inquiry displayed a very pragmatic approach. Whatever worked for them in terms of standards, they used. The success or failure of an institutional library program is very closely linked to the personalities involved, especially to the librarian's. Standards, no matter how carefully written, are only as successful as the librarian makes them. Institutional library standards are not the "be all and end all," but simply one of the many tools which may help improve library services at the disposal of the institutional librarian, of the state library agency, and of the institution's administration.

The previous arguments might lead one to conclude that national standards are not very important. Certainly, the pragmatic, "use-whatever-works" approach employed by institutional libraries seems to vitiate the need for national standards for institutional libraries. And yet the national standards are needed. They are the strongest link an institutional library has to the rest of the library profession. Good, effective standards represent the best thinking on what quality library service is, and they focus constantly on the need to improve library services. Without national standards, state and local institutional libraries might become bogged down in the minutiae of their situations and lose sight of overall goals.

Conclusions

Institutional libraries present special problems and challenges. In most places the institutional library is not under the control of a library entity. Even in those states where outside staff or administration is provided, the institutional library still must function, first and foremost, within the institution. Most states' institutional libraries as a whole are inadequate by almost any measure one might use. Libraries probably do not make it into the administrator's top ten priority items. Even in those places where the library has strong backing from the administration, there may be too little money to provide meaningful support. Isolation often plagues institutional libraries—few are members of multitype library cooperatives; some are in physically iso-

lated locations; the librarian may rarely see other librarians; and training and travel funds are limited or nonexistent.

In institutional library work it is the library which must bridge the gap, often between very disparate organizations, if the bridge is ever to be built. Almost without exception, it is the librarian who approaches the correctional, mental health, or other nonlibrary organization or institution and initiates work to improve library services. Only rarely does the reverse hold true. And it is the library which must be the chameleon, changing its color to suit the surroundings. Certainly, the American Library Association must continue to produce standards where needed, but it must also realize that "anything goes" when it comes to realizing the goals inherent in those standards.

A great number of people who criticize library standards in particular comment on the vague and overlapping uses made of them. One writer stated, "Standards may be interpreted variously as the pattern of an ideal, a model procedure, a measure for appraisal, a stimulus for future development and improvement, and as an instrument to assist decision and action."[46] The context in which this quotation appeared carried with it an implied criticism of the multiplicity of uses of standards. But standards, at least as they are employed in the institutional setting, are all these and more. In fact, the more creative one is able to be in using the standards, the greater the chances of meeting them. It would be wonderful, would it not, simply to issue institutional library standards and then wait as the administrators of each institution moved to meet the standards? Unfortunately, that is not the case, and standards which cannot be used as a combination club and carrot, and as a means of convincing, cajoling and wheedling are not likely to survive long in the institutional setting.

A number of tentative conclusions can be drawn from the various standards, guidelines, policies, and procedures gathered from around the country, and from personal experiences in Missouri. The first is that it is always better to be talking and planning with institutions about their library services than to reject them if they do not "come up to standard." There are, of course, limits to the tolerance which can be displayed; some institutions need to be left alone until they want library services, or until a key stumbling block is removed. The second conclusion is that one should not worry too much about the purity of the standards used. "Whatever works" is probably a better guideline, based on the variety of standards observed by this author. Finally, convincing the institution's administration (or even higher officials in the department which administers a number of similar institutions) appears to be the best method to ensure acceptance of the standards.

The following recommendations, growing out of these conclusions, are listed here in hopes that they may prove useful to those less familiar with institutional library work. To those experienced in the field, they are nothing new.

1. Be ready, willing and able to compromise when using standards.
2. Involve the nonlibrary administering agencies in the standards writing, rewriting or implementing process. Allow consideration of standards before imposing them.
3. Try to have the standards adopted by the institution, even if this requires some modification.
4. Work with institutions and related administering agencies (e.g., state department of mental health), as well as related organizations (e.g., state sheriffs' association), to incorporate library standards into state and local statutes and into institution policies. This is a long and tedious process, and it is unlikely that such library standards will ever be as complete as librarians would like, but it is worth the effort.
5. Consider adopting standards of nonlibrary organizations if they will lead to improved library services.

The beginning of the *ALA Standards Manual* has something to say on this last point: "Standards published by another organization may be adopted as a standard by a division after their review by the Committee on Standards, to determine whether they are consistent with ALA goals, policies, and standards."[47] Despite this provision, the cross-fertilization which would be brought about by such acceptance is rare in ALA. Whether or not such activities should be more evident on the national level is debatable. But for the librarian working with a state-run or local institution, such local compromise may mean the difference between library services surviving or going under.

Institutional library standards offer a means of effecting change and serve as a guidepost for the librarian trying to justify the existence of the library in the face of so many other priorities. These standards represent a significant contribution to the constant struggle to improve library services to hundreds of thousands of people in the institutions of this country.

References

1. Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies. *Standards for Libraries at Institutions for the Mentally Retarded.* Chicago: ALA, 1981.
2. Ibid., p. 17.

3. American Library Association. Committee on Standards. *ALA Standards Manual.* Chicago: ALA, 1976.

4. ASCLA, *Standards for Mentally Retarded,* p. 19.

5. Ibid.

6. *Interim Standards for Libraries in Residential Institutions for the Mentally Retarded in Missouri and Iowa.* n.p.: State Library Commission of Iowa and Missouri State Library, 1977.

7. Ibid., p. 1.

8. "Guidelines for Patient Libraries in Mental Health Institutions." [Harrisburg]: State Library of Pennsylvania, 1980.

9. Association of Hospital and Institutional Libraries. *Standards for Library Services in Health Care Institutions.* Chicago: ALA, 1970.

10. ASCLA, *Standards for Mentally Retarded.*

11. Missouri Committee on Standards for Library Services to the Mentally Ill. *Missouri Standards for Library Services to the Mentally Ill.* [Jefferson City: Missouri State Library], 1981.

12. Ibid., p. 1.

13. American Correctional Association and ALA Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division. Joint Committee on Institution Libraries. *Library Standards for Juvenile Correctional Institutions.* [Chicago]: ACA and ALA, 1975.

14. Ibid., p. iv.

15. *Library Standards for California State Department of the Youth Authority Facilities.* Sacramento: Education Service Unit, California State Department of the Youth Authority, 1981.

16. *Elementary-Secondary Guide for Oregon Schools, 1980: Standards for Public Schools.* Salem: Oregon Department of Education, 1980.

17. American Correctional Association and American Library Association. Joint Committee on Institution Libraries. *Library Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions.* Chicago: Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies, 1981.

18. Commission on Accreditation for Corrections. *Manual of Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions.* Rockville, Md.: American Correctional Association, 1977.

19. *Library Policy and Procedures Manual.* [Austin]: Texas Department of Corrections, 1977.

20. *Adult Correctional Facility Library Guidelines.* Harrisburg: State Library of Pennsylvania, 1981.

21. ACA/ALA Joint Committee, *Adult Correctional Institutions,* pp. 10, 12, 13.

22. Committee on Law Library Service to Prisoners. *Recommended Collections for Prison and Other Institution Law Libraries.* [Chicago]: American Association of Law Libraries, 1976.

23. *Providing Legal Services for Prisoners: A Tool for Correctional Administrators.* College Park, Md.: American Correctional Association, 1977.

24. Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies. *Library Standards for Jails and Detention Facilities.* Chicago: ALA, 1981.

25. Ibid., p. 2.

26. Bureau of Detention Facilities and Jail Standards. *Illinois County Jail Standards.* [Springfield]: Illinois Department of Corrections, 1971, p. 112.

27. Association of Hospital and Institution Libraries. *Standards for Library Services in Health Care Institutions.* Chicago: ALA, 1970.

28. Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies. *Equal Access: A Manual of Procedures for Initiating a Public Library Home Service Program.* Chicago: ALA, 1979.

29. "Guidelines for Library Services to an Aging Population." *RQ* 3(Spring 1975):237-39.

30. Betty Siedschlaw to Miller, personal communication, 29 June 1981.

31. Arizona Department of Library, Archives and Public Records. *Arizona Long-Range Program: 1980/1984 Revised and Extended.* Phoenix: Department of Library, Archives and Public Records, n.d.

32. American Association of State Libraries. Standards Revision Committee. *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level,* rev. ed. Chicago: ALA, 1970.

33. Ibid., pp. 20-22.

34. Ibid., pp. 39.

35. ALA Committee on Standards, *ALA Standards Manual,* p. 3.

36. Ibid., p. 4.

37. Bloss, Meredith. "Research; and Standards for Library Service." *Library Research* 2(Winter 1980):285-308.

38. Ibid., p. 286.

39. Ibid., p. 289.

40. ALA Committee on Standards, *ALA Standards Manual,* p. 3.

41. Bloss, "Research," p. 292.

42. ALA Committee on Standards, *ALA Standards Manual,* p. iii.

43. Lancaster, F. Wilfrid. *The Measurement and Evaluation of Library Services.* Washington, D.C.: Information Resources Press, 1977, p. 296. Quoted *in* Bloss, "Research," p. 293.

44. Boyer, Robert E. "Do We Use the Standards? Yes, but...." *Catholic Library World* 48(Feb. 1977):294. Quoted *in* Bloss, "Research," p. 299.

45. Martin, Lowell A. "Standards for Public Libraries." *Library Trends* 21(Oct. 1972):171. Quoted *in* Bloss, "Research," p. 295.

46. Lancaster, *Measurement and Evaluation,* p. 288. Quoted *in* Bloss, "Research," p. 291.

47. ALA Committee on Standards, *ALA Standards Manual,* p. 1.

Standards for Health Sciences Libraries

E. RAY STINSON

DEVELOPING STANDARDS FOR health sciences libraries is difficult because of the variety of libraries providing services to individuals in a health care setting. These include academic, hospital and special libraries (e.g., pharmaceutical companies). Even within these categories, one can see a great deal of variation. For example, an academic health sciences library may serve one or two programs in the allied health field, a medical school, or a health sciences center serving a multitude of academic programs. Among hospital libraries there is a great deal of difference between the large teaching hospital with extensive responsibilities for graduate medical education and the hospital responsible for health care delivery in a rural community.

Service standards are defined as a level of excellence or adequacy in the performance of library service, and will be the scope of this paper. They may be identified as standards, guidelines, norms, requirements, principles, and/or lists. Service standards may be qualitative (e.g., the informational, educational and research-related needs shall be met) or quantitative (e.g., *x* number of seats per number of enrolled students). Traditionally, standards were quantitative and looked at the budget, staff, collection size, and physical facilities. The current trend is to develop qualitative standards which are derived from a philosophical point of view.

This paper will first discuss the standards that have been instrumental in improving hospital library service. It will then discuss the standards in academic health sciences libraries, and finally will review

E. Ray Stinson is Resource Information Coordinator, Office of Sponsored Programs—Academic, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston.

the certification program developed for health sciences librarians by the Medical Library Association (MLA). Because special health sciences libraries can best be evaluated in terms of meeting the goals outlined by their parent organizations, there has been little effort to develop standards for them. These and any health sciences library may participate in a goal-setting program to develop standards based upon the mission of their institution. Self and Gebhart have discussed a quality assurance process that can be used in establishing the goals for a health sciences library.[1]

Hospital Library Service

During the last decade, one of the biggest developments in health sciences librarianship has been the increased importance and development of the hospital library. Van Gieson has stated:

> While knowledge expanded, greater numbers of more sophisticated professionals became available, taking positions and establishing practices outside the major metropolitan areas with their educational centers. These people were formed from a new mold and were accustomed to equipment of the latest vintage as well as—and this is the point—information on care and treatment methods just discovered or developed.[2]

Because of this new importance on information, new standards for professional library service were incorporated within the *Accreditation Manual for Hospitals* in 1978. The Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Hospitals (JCAH), which developed the manual, is a voluntary organization with representatives from the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American College of Physicians, and the American College of Surgeons. It functions to publish standards for the operation of hospitals and accredits those institutions which meet the standards.[3] Eloise Foster in her 1979 paper, and Judith Topper, et al., in their 1980 paper reviewed these standards in depth.[4]

The JCAH works from a philosophy that all hospitals must be accredited under the same guidelines. Consequently, the standards must apply to the teaching hospital, the hospital conducting extensive research, the urban hospital, and the hospital serving a rural community. These could only be accomplished with the development of qualitative standards. The standards were developed from a general principle which reads: "The hospital shall provide library services to meet the informational, educational, and, when appropriate, the research-

related needs of the medical and hospital staffs."[5] Two standards which are clarified in an interpretation section support the general principle. The standards state: "The professional library services shall be organized to assure appropriate direction or supervision, staffing, and resources"; and "The provision of professional library service shall be guided by written policies and procedures."[6]

Topper et al. have stated that the standards parallel in both subject matter and emphasis the standards set for other clinical support departments. In conclusion they stated:

> Before 1978, the JCAH standards for professional library services were so vague as to provide little basis for the librarian to prepare for an accreditation visit, or for a surveyor to judge the caliber of library services provided. This situation has been greatly improved. It is to be expected that surveyors will gradually come to demand of the library evidence of the same high level of professionalism that is expected of other hospital departments.[7]

As part of the accreditation process, each hospital must complete a hospital survey profile. The section on library services asks for a description of current library practices and identifies which documents must be available for the accreditation team to review.[8]

The original draft of the standards was developed by the Medical Library Association in 1974.[9] With the implementation of new standards, MLA disbanded a committee to study the feasibility of developing its own accreditation program.[10] While mental health hospitals were omitted from the standards, the Hospital Library Standards and Practices Committee of MLA and JCAH are working to resolve the restriction.[11]

The Canadian Library Association, the Canadian Regional Group of the Medical Library Association, the Ontario Medical Association, the Canadian Medical Association, and the Association of Canadian Medical Colleges developed a set of standards for Canadian hospital libraries in 1974. These are similar to the standards that MLA recommended to the JCAH. As with the JCAH standards, the Canadian guidelines were developed from a general principle, which states: "The hospital shall provide library service appropriate to the professional, technical, educational and administrative needs of the medical and other hospital staff."[12] From this principle the Canadians developed four standards dealing with: (1) objectives, organization, and administration; (2) staffing and personnel qualification; (3) nature and scope of services; and (4) facilities and equipment for the hospital library. An interpretation section was included to give hospital librarians and

administrators assistance in meeting the standards.[13] To serve as a starting point for the design of library and information services, an appendix of minimum quantitative standards was originally included but removed in the final edition.[14]

Both the JCAH and Canadian standards were developed as minimum standards. However, hospital librarians and administrators may need to use them to justify improvements. McGrath did a survey to determine if Massachusetts hospital libraries met the standards outlined by the JCAH and Canadian standards. Of the 102 out of 135 hospitals responding to the survey, 57 percent were judged not in compliance with at least one of the JCAH standards. When judged against the Canadian quantitative standards outlined in the appendix, 48 percent fall below the minimum standards set for their category.[15]

The Veterans Administration has its own inspection program for hospital libraries. It includes approved guidelines for space and equipment; staffing guidelines are scheduled to be approved in the near-future.[16] They also recommend the use of a standard list in the development of library collections. These core listings were first developed by Sterns and Ratcliff in 1970 and, in an indirect way, may be considered minimum collection standards.[17] A selective listing of these "core" collections is provided in the Additional References to this article.

The Connecticut Association of Health Sciences Libraries (CAHSL) developed a set of qualitative standards and checklist for health sciences libraries. As part of the Regional Medical Program, minimum quantitative guidelines were developed in 1970 and revised in 1973.[18] In 1975 the Standards Committee of the CAHSL published a set of qualitative standards and checklist for health sciences libraries. Fourteen standards established the basis for effective library service.[19] The Pacific Southwest Regional Medical Library Service has updated the guidelines to reflect current standards and costs.[20]

Based upon the JCAH standards, the Committee for the Promotion of Hospital Library Services of the Western New York Library Resources Council developed the "Standards for Professional Health Sciences Library Services in Hospitals of New York State." These include eleven qualitative standards developed from a general principle. The New York State Legislative Assembly is considering a bill that would allow hospital libraries meeting the standards to be eligible for membership in the New York State Reference and Research Library Resources System Councils. Libraries not meeting the standards would not be eligible for membership without submitting a five-year plan for meeting those

standards. Under the terms of the bill, funding would be provided to hospital libraries with membership in the councils.[21] As proposed, this added incentive is unique for hospital libraries.

Academic Health Sciences Libraries

As with hospital libraries, there has been a large increase in the number of academic health science libraries during the past decade. In the early 1970s, several medical schools began to develop branches or multiple campuses. Consequently, the medical school library does not always serve the traditional four year program. Some may serve students enrolled in only the first two years while others serve students in the latter years of medical education. In addition, many medical school libraries have merged with libraries from other programs within their institution (dental, nursing, etc.) to form a health sciences library with a broad clientele. Universities, colleges, junior colleges, and technical institutes have also developed programs for training in the allied health fields. With these changes the academic health sciences library is no longer synonymous with the medical school library. This has required the development of qualitative standards to be used in the accreditation process for a particular program. The purpose of the accreditation process is to provide a professional judgment on the quality of the education program.

The Association of American Medical Colleges and the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association sponsors the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) to accredit U.S. and Canadian medical schools.[22] In 1979, the Committee on Accreditation of Canadian Medical Schools began to accredit their schools. However, at present, it does not replace accreditation by the LCME.[23] The LCME accreditation manual discusses the library in two separate sections. Under "Functions and Structure of a Medical School," it states:

> A well-maintained and catalogued library, sufficient in size and breadth to support the educational programs that are operated by the institution, is essential to a medical school. The library should receive the leading medical periodicals, the current numbers of which should be readily accessible. The library or other learning resource should also be equipped to allow students to gain experience with self-instructional devices. A professional library staff should supervise the development and operation of the library.[24]

Three paragraphs under the "Guidelines" section also discuss the library.

> The library should be appropriate for the goals and objectives of the medical school. The library committee of the faculty is helpful in advising the librarian and in the development of a formal procedure by which the faculty may make appropriate recommendations regarding the acquisition of library materials.
>
> It is important that a professional library staff be responsive to the needs of the school of medicine. If the library which serves the school of medicine is a part of a medical center, or of the university library system, it is essential that the professional staff responsible for providing library services to the medical school be responsive to the needs of the school. Medical libraries have evolved to be more than the collection of volumes and serials. The librarian should be familiar with the resources for maintaining the relationship between the library and national library systems and resources, and with the expansion of the library to provide services in non-print materials. As the faculty and students served by the library become more dispersed, the role of departmental and branch libraries should receive consideration by the librarian and by the administration and faculty of the school.
>
> The library should be considered as a community resource in support of continuing medical education.[25]

This latter paragraph clearly emphasizes that the accreditation team considers the medical library a vital resource in the continuing education activities of the institution.

As part of the accreditation process, a self-study document is prepared in response to basic questions asked by the LCME. As with other parts of the self-study, the library section asks for quantitative data to determine the activities of the library. A second part requests the opinions of the staff as to the effectiveness of the resources and programs provided by the library.[26]

The Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education discusses biomedical information in their guidelines. They state:

> Institutions offering approved residencies should provide access to biomedical information including carefully selected, authoritative medical textbooks and monographs, recent editions of the *Index Medicus*, and current medical journals in the various branches of medicine and surgery in which training is being conducted, as well as other learning rsources (e.g., audiovisuals). The information resources should be properly supervised.[27]

The accreditation of dental schools is handled by the Commission on Dental Accreditation of the American Dental Association. They view the dental library in much the same way as the LCME views the medical library. They provide a general statement on the role of the library in the educational process, and ask basic quantitative questions about the library in their self-study.[28] The Council on Dental Education is also

responsible for programs in dental assisting, dental hygiene, and dental laboratory technology. All three standards identify the essential services that the library should provide, and discuss the collection, facilities, hours, policies, and budget necessary for an adequate library.[29]

The National League for Nursing accredits four types of nursing schools. They include: (1) baccalaureate and higher degree programs, (2) associate degree programs, (3) diploma programs, and(4) practical nursing programs.[30] The guidelines for practical nursing programs are the most recently updated and state that library resources should be "readily available to faculty and students; they provide comprehensive, appropriate reference materials and current books, periodicals, and audiovisuals pertinent to each area of the program."[31] The guidelines for the other programs are similar. The self-study and site visit are used by the National League for Nursing to determine whether the library is adequate.[32]

The Council on Education for the American Occupational Therapy Association, in collaboration with the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association, accredits educational programs for the occupational therapist. The Council on Education listed among essential requirements that: "A library must be accessible, containing current standard text, scientific books, periodicals and other reference materials. Full privileges of the library should be available to the occupational therapy department and its students. There should be adequate budgetary provision for the purpose of pertinent reference materials to support occupational therapy education."[33]

The National Association of Physical Therapists also works with the American Medical Association to accredit programs in its field. Its guidelines state, "Instructional aids such as clinical materials, reference materials, demonstration and other multi-media materials, must be provided."[34]

In 1971, P.L. Dressel stated that:

> The last decade has witnessed accelerated changes in this accreditation process. Formerly, accreditation practices were made mechanical and inflexible by the specifications and application of specific factors as percent doctorates, library holdings and salaries. The shift in emphasis has been in the direction of assurance and incentives toward quality with the onus placed on the institution.[35]

With this shift toward qualitative standards, the importance of the self-study and site visit is all-important in determining the adequacy of the library and its services. The organization which makes the best use of the self-study is the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education,

which accredits schools of pharmacy. Some questions are similar to those in other self-studies in that they ask for quantitative information to document the adequacy of the library. The American Council on Pharmaceutical Education also asks questions which assist the library staff in determining if they are meeting the needs of their institutions. These include questions about what the library did to resolve deficiencies uncovered in the most recent comprehensive self-study, and questions about the faculty and student evaluation of the library. The council is also unique in that it specifies that one of the responsibilities of the librarian is to develop "effective strategies to teach students the proper use of the profesional literature in the kinds of practices which they are likely to engage."[36] At best this educational function is only inferred in the guidelines for the other academic programs.

MLA Certification Program

While the MLA has been active in the development of standards to be recommended to the JCAH and the various groups developing standards for academic health sciences libraries, it has been most active in the development of its own certification program. Jordan, Libbey, Darling, Hill, and Proctor have written excellent articles on the certification program of MLA.[37]

In her 1946 presidential address to the MLA, Mary Louise Marshall cited her internship program and recommended some association action on the question of formal education for medical librarians.[38] In her summary of the arguments for certification, Mildred Jordan stated that it would serve as a method of establishing minimum standards and training for the group, thus assuring a higher level of service to the medical public.[39] A committee recommended at the 1947 annual meeting that training should be at three levels:

> *Grade I.* Library school training with work in library administration, medical bibliography, etc.
> *Grade II.* Requirements for Grade I plus six months' experience under an approved librarian.
> *Grade III.* Training leading to an advanced degree or its equivalent.[40]

The committee also recommended that certification be recognized at the same three levels. After revising the proposal to include a grandfather's clause, the recommendation passed the following year.[41]

A subcommittee on curriculum was appointed and produced the "Code for the Training and Certification of Medical Librarians."[42] The

standards were designed to serve as a guide in the development of courses, and were used as a measuring stick in approving or disapproving those courses. Thus, individuals certified at the Grade I level were individuals who graduated from a library school and completed an approved course in medical librarianship.[43] While there was some minor revision in 1956, a major revision was incorporated in 1964 by adding an examination as an approved method for certification. At that time Grade II was also revised to permit a graduate degree in a related subject field as an alternative to an intership.[44] Darling has expressed the view that the certification program has never operated beyond the Grade I level except on a token basis.[45]

In 1972 Martha Jane Zachert and Joan Titley chaired a committee to propose a new code.[46] A revision of the committee's recommendations was approved by the membership in 1974. An essential difference between the two codes is that while the original provided for a variety of ways to be certified, the present code is based upon a competency examination. The current code also requires recertification every five years.[47]

The 1974 code was implemented in 1978 and revised in 1981, when the MLA Board of Directors decided not to implement a certification program for health sciences library technicians. They concluded that there was insufficient demand and financial support for the technician program. As revised, the requirement for certification includes:

> (1) graduate from a library school program accredited by the American Library Association; and
>
> (2) a passing grade on an examination (assessing the entry level competencies required by health sciences librarians); this examination to be administered by the Association; and
>
> (3) two years (or the equivalent) of post-library degree experience as a health sciences librarian at the professional level within the previous ten years.[48]

A passing score is required on each of three sections: administration, public services, and technical services.[49]

The code will grant certification to qualified applicants for a maximum period of five years. To ensure continued competence, recertification requires participation in thirty-five contact hours of continuing education (CE) activities: (1) courses and workshops, and (2) individual accomplishments. Certain types of courses and workshops have been automatically approved for CE credit. These consist of MLA continuing education courses, courses offered by other national associations, the online training courses offered by the National Library of Medicine or the Canada Institute for Scientific and Technical Informa-

tion, the National Medical Audiovisual Center courses, and courses offered by academic organizations. An MLA Continuing Education Committee is responsible for approving other types of continuing education activities. A person can also be recertified by teaching or developing an MLA continuing education course, developing a media or computer-assisted instructional package, or publishing. Credits for each of these activities are spelled out in the MLA publication, "MLA Requirements for Recertification for Health Sciences Librarians."[50]

To provide a mechanism for health sciences librarians to obtain recertification, the MLA has been extremely active in the development of its own CE programs. These courses were first available at the 1964 annual meeting, and since 1965 have also been available at the regional meetings. Forty-nine CE course sessions were offered at the 1980 annual meeting, compared to thirty-six sessions at the 1979 meeting.[51] It is too early to tell whether the recertification process will be a success. Individuals originally certified in 1978 will not be required to be recertified until December 31, 1982. However, it can be concluded that health sciences librarians are actively participating in CE activities.[52]

In conclusion, it should be stated that there have been major improvements in the development and use of standards since the 1972 article by Helen Yast.[53] Hospital library standards have been improved and the library's place in the accreditation process is equal to that of other service departments within the hospital. The standards for health sciences librarians have been improved, and while it is too early to tell if recertification is a success, the tremendous growth of the MLA continuing education programs may indicate that it will succeed. The standards for academic health sciences libraries continue to be part of the accreditation process of the parent institution. The usefulness of all standards can only be measured by their implementation within the institution. With the development of qualitative standards, the evaluation process has also been improved.

References

1. Self, Phyllis C., and Gebhart, Karen A. "A Quality Assurance Process in Health Sciences Libraries." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 68(July 1980):288-92.

2. Van Gieson, W.R. "The Hospital Library in Transition." *Hospital Progress* 59(June 1978):66.

3. Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Hospitals. *Accreditation Manual for Hospitals*. Chicago: JCAH, 1978.

4. Foster, Eloise C. "Library Development and the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals Standards." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 67(April

1979):226-31; and Topper, Judith M., et al. "JCAH Accreditation and the Hospital Library." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 68(April 1980):212-19.

5. JCAH, *Accreditation Manual*, p. 127.

6. Ibid., pp. 127-28.

7. Topper, et al., "JCAH Accreditation," p. 218.

8. Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Hospitals. "Professional Library Services." In *Hospital Survey Profile*. Chicago: JCAH, 1981, pp. 169-72.

9. *See* Yast, Helen. "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review JCAH *Accreditation Manual for Hospitals.*" *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 64(Jan. 1976):153.

10. Wender, Ruth W. "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Feasibility of an Accreditation Program or Suitable Alternatives for Hospital Libraries, Etc." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 67(Jan. 1979):157-59.

11. Hill, Sara I. "Report of the Hospital Library Standards and Practices Committee." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 69(Jan. 1981):130.

12. "Canadian Standards for Hospital Libraries." *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 112(17 May 1975):1272.

13. Ibid., pp. 1271-74.

14. Topper, et al., "JCAH Accreditation."

15. McGrath, Patricia J. "Hospital Library Resources in Massachusetts." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 68(Oct. 1980):348-56.

16. Veterans Administration. "Library Service." In *Planning Criteria for VA Facilities* (H-08-9). Washington, D.C.: VA, Feb. 1980; and _____. "Library Service." In *Equipment Guidelist* (H-08-5). Washington, D.C.: VA, Nov. 1981.

17. Sterns, Norman S., and Ratcliff, Wendy W. "An Integrated Health-Science Core Library for Physicians, Nurses, and Allied Health Practitioners in Community Hospitals." *New England Journal of Medicine* 283(31 Dec. 1970):1489-98.

18. Connecticut Association of Health Sciences Libraries. Technical Advisory Committee on Library Services. *Suggested Minimum Guidelines for Connecticut Health Science Libraries*. New Haven: Connecticut Regional Medical Program, 1970; rev. ed., 1973.

19. Connecticut Association of Health Sciences Libraries. Standards Committee. "Connecticut Association of Health Sciences Libraries: Standards and Checklist for Health Sciences Libraries." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 63(Oct. 1975):417-21.

20. Pacific Southwest Regional Medical Library Service. "Suggested Minimum Guidelines for Health Science Libraries." *Fact Sheet*, June 1978.

21. Hutchinson, Ann P., et al. "Proposed Standards for Professional Health Sciences Library Services in Hospitals of New York State." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 69(July 1981):287-93.

22. Liaison Committee on Medical Education. *Accreditation of Schools of Medicine: Policy Documents and Guidelines*. Chicago: LCME, 1976.

23. Garner, J. "Accreditation of Medical Schools Becomes a Canadian Operation." *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 121(4 Aug. 1979):345.

24. LCME, *Accreditation of Schools of Medicine*, p. 6.

25. Ibid., p. 20.

26. _____. *LCME Data Base*. Chicago: AMA, 1976.

27. Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education. *Directory of Residency Training Programs, 81/82*. Chicago: The Council, 1981, p. 9.

28. American Dental Association. *Procedures for Evaluation: Requirements and Guidelines for Dental Education Programs*. Chicago: ADA, 1980.

29. Council on Dental Education. "New Education Standards for Dental Auxiliary Education Programs." *Journal of the American Dental Association* 88(May 1974):1043-61.

30. National League for Nursing. *Criteria for the Appraisal of Baccalaureate and Higher Degree Programs in Nursing*, 4th ed. New York: NLN, 1977; Division of Associate

Degree Programs. *Criteria for the Evaluation of Educational Programs in Nursing Leading to an Associate Degree*, 5th ed. rev. New York: NLN, 1977; Department of Diploma Programs. *Criteria for the Evaluation of Diploma Programs in Nursing*, 5th ed. New York: NLN, 1978; and Council of Practical Nursing Programs. *Criteria for the Evaluation of Educational Programs in Practical Nursing*, 4th ed. New York: NLN, 1981.

31. Council of Practical Nursing Programs, *Criteria in Practical Nursing*, p. 12.

32. Hawken, Patty L., and Reed, Suellen B. "Preparing for Accreditation." *Nursing Outlook* 26(Dec. 1978):761-65.

33. American Occupational Therapy Association. "Essentials of an Accredited Education Program for the Occupational Therapist." Chicago: AOTA, 1972, p. 15.

34. National Association of Physical Therapists. *Essentials of an Accredited Educational Program for the Physical Therapist and Accompanying Guidelines*. West Covina, Calif.: NAPT, 1978, p. 35.

35. Dressel, P.L. "Accreditation and Institutional Self-Study." *The North American Association Quarterly* 56(Oct. 1971):286.

36. American Council on Pharmaceutical Education. *Accreditation Manual*, 7th ed. Chicago: ACPE, 1976, p. II-B4.

37. Jordan, Mildred. "Certification: A Stage of Professionalism." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 36(Jan. 1948):108-16; Libbey, Miriam H. "MLA Certification: The Certification Program and Education for Medical Librarianship." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 55(Jan. 1967):5-8; Darling, Louise. "The View Behind and Ahead: Implications of Certification." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 61(Oct. 1973):375-86; Hill, Barbara. "The Development of Education for Medical Librarians." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 60(Jan. 1972):121-32; and Proctor, Vilma. "MLA Certification: Its Present Problems and Future Development." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 55(Jan. 1967):9-12.

38. Marshall, Mary L. "Training for Medical Librarianship." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 34(Oct. 1946):247-65.

39. Jordan, "Certification," p. 112.

40. Medical Library Association. Training for Medical Librarianship Committee. "Report; Statement on Proposed Certification Program: Minority Report." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 35(July 1947):201-20.

41. Libbey, "MLA Certification."

42. Medical Library Association. Committee on Standards for Hospital Libraries. "Code for the Training and Certification of Medical Librarians." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 40(Oct. 1952):388.

43. Libbey, "MLA Certification."

44. Hill, "Development of Education."

45. Darling, "View Behind and Ahead."

46. Ibid.

47. *See* Schmidt, Dean. "Certification of Medical Librarians, 1949-1977." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 67(Jan. 1979):31-35.

48. Medical Library Association. *Code for the Certification of Health Sciences Librarians*, rev. ed. Chicago: MLA, 1981, pp. 1-2.

49. _____. *Certification Examination for Health Sciences Librarians*. Chicago: MLA, 1980.

50. _____ . "MLA Requirements for Recertification for Health Sciences Librarians." Chicago: MLA, 1979.

51. Zeenan, Joan, ed. "Proceedings, Eightieth Annual Meeting of the Medical Library Association, Washington, D.C., 11-19 June 1980." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 69(Jan. 1981):62.

52. Aguirre, Anthony. "Report of the Continuing Education Committee." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 69(Jan. 1981):146-48.

53. Yast, Helen. "Standards for Library Service in Institutions: In the Health Care Setting." *Library Trends* 21(Oct. 1972):267-85.

Additional References

Allyn R. "A Library for Internists III: Recommended by the American College of Physicians." *Annals of Internal Medicine* 90(March 1979):446-77.

Brandon, Alfred N., and Hill, Dorothy R. "Selective List of Books and Journals for the Small Medical Library." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 69(April 1981): 185-215.

_____. "Selected List of Nursing Books and Journals."*Nursing Outlook* 27(Oct. 1979):672-80.

Library Association. *Books and Periodicals for Medical Libraries in Hospitals,* 5th ed. London: LA, 1978.

Moseley, James L. "Selected List of Family Medicine Books and Journals for the Small Medical Library." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 68(July 1980):297-98.

Raskin, Robert B., and Hathorn, Isabel V. "Selected List of Books and Journals for a Small Dental Library." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 68(July 1980):263-70.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Canadian Library Standards

CATRIONA DE SCOSSA
MARY E.P. HENDERSON

FLORENCE MURRAY, WHO DESCRIBED the development and state of Canadian library standards in the October 1972 issue of *Library Trends*, stated at the outset that:

> Library standards reflect the objectives and priorities of the nation that produces them, and change as the nation changes. Canadian standards show evidence of the shifting relationships between the federal, provincial and local governments, the leadership newly assumed by the federal government in the provision of information to citizens, the effects of urbanization, a developing consciousness of social responsibilities and, above all, the rapidly changing patterns of education.[1]

Little has changed in the intervening decade, except that jurisdictional friction between levels of government is increasingly evident (witness the long debate over the "patriation" of the Canadian constitution), change in educational patterns reflects diminishing rather than growing funding, and Information Canada, a federal government creation—perhaps seen to be more propaganda than information—scarcely survived infancy.

Yet, to write about Canadian library standards in 1982 is to undertake a significantly different task from that carried out by Murray in 1972. At that time, one still enjoyed the afterglow of the economic prosperity of the 1960s, and the standards, plans and projections dis-

Catriona de Scossa is Associate Professor, Faculty of Library Science, and Mary E.P. Henderson is Professor, Faculty of Library Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

cussed seemed largely to point the way to a future of assured, rational growth. Standards developed in the 1950s and 1960s appeared to provide a valid framework for such progress.

Canada's political and economic volatility, of course, does nothing to simplify the modernization and application of standards. Provinces are constantly trying to widen and deepen their jurisdictions—jurisdictions which, from the beginning, have included education and publicly supported library services. The economy is ravaged by steadily worsening inflation, with its predictable effect on the books and materials budgets; and Canada is particularly affected in this area, because the bulk of its library materials must be imported, and paid for in soft and fluctuating currency. Great regional disparities, which prompt considerable population migration (or drift), add further complications to local and area planning and provision for libraries. Finally, there seems to be the possibility that the province of Quebec may detach itself almost totally from the rest of the country. It already has its own francophone library association, L'Association pour l'Avancement des Sciences et des Techniques de la Documentation (ASTED), quite distinct from the Canadian Library Association. The effect of such devolution on national standards might be considerable.

Murray, in effect, sums up the pre-seventies Canadian situation with the comment that: "A study of Canadian library standards leads to the conclusion that standards, if successful, have a short active life; they promote the development of service that makes possible new objectives that in turn demand new standards."[2] However, the term *standard*, here as elsewhere, seems not to be clearly defined. In so-called standards themselves, and in discussions concerning them, the word *standard* may be used to mean both "standard" as defined in Webster—"something that is established by authority, custom or general consent as a model or example to be followed; a definite level or degree of quality that is proper or adequate for a specific purpose"[3]—and, interchangeably, "specification," defined by Webster as "a detailed, precise, explicit presentation (as by enumeration, description or working drawing) of something or a plan or proposal for something."[4] To muddy the waters further, the terms *guidelines* and *manual* are also used in contexts which may imply standards or specifications.

It seems reasonable that true standards should be broadly based, essentially qualitative, with descriptive terms carefully, but not rigidly, defined. They should state the purpose, the raison d'être, of libraries and their component parts, and should spring from a sound grasp of the significance of libraries past and present, and the potential roles of the

library in the world of tomorrow. A clear goal must always be identified. The goal, the standards to be achieved, having been established, specifications—probably quantitative—would indicate how to meet the standards. The specifications should be flexible or adjustable in order to cope with changing times, user needs and financial support, but their thrust should be toward meeting or surpassing the standards. Thus the end will remain essentially unchanged, though the means to that end will almost certainly change. The present lack of clear distinction between standard and specification has resulted in a lack of clearly identified long-term goals for libraries, both the means and the ends being in constant flux.

Until *Project Progress* (discussed later) was developed and implemented under the auspices of the Canadian Library Association (CLA), and its report published in 1981[5] in time for distribution at CLA's annual conference, there has been since 1967 no Canada-wide attempt to update standards in the field of public libraries, nor to prepare the ground for such updating. However, individual provinces produced documents relating to their own needs and state of development, which may be seen as local adaptations of the national standards of 1967.

British Columbia's Library Development Commission, with a long history of incremental development plans, produced second and third editions of *Quantitative Standards for Public Libraries* in 1973 and 1978.[6] The first edition appeared in 1968 and specified levels of service—interim standards, perhaps—to be achieved by 1971; and the 1973 edition then upgraded the requirements, to be met by 1976, and so on. In each case, steady improvement to at least the minima indicated was required, "thereby assuring the library of continuing maximum provincial support."[7] These standards are designed to serve libraries operating with a population base of up to 50,000 and indicate the numbers and kinds of volumes, opening hours, staffing and equipment appropriate. The Library Development Commission has also drawn up *Standards for Integrated Library Systems* (1973),[8] again a working rather than a philosphic document, covering briefly five major aspects of library service: government and structure; service; collections; personnel; facilities. These requirements must also be met by systems applying for, or depending on, provincial grants. Turning to those areas in the province as yet unserved by library systems (the terrain is almost totally mountainous), the Library Services Branch, now under the British Columbia Ministry of Recreation and Conservation, prepared in 1978 "Reading Centres: Requirements and Standards."[9] A reading center is defined as "the basic unit for public library services

which is eligible for Provincial recognition and support."[10] The document deals essentially with the regulations for becoming a reading center (a deposit station for a changing collection of rented books), and the minimum requirements to qualify as a borrowing agency. Thus, British Columbia spells out action at all levels of service.

In Saskatchewan, which enjoys almost complete regional library coverage, the Saskatchewan Library Association (SLA) established in 1977 a Task Force on Standards to develop standards for public (regional) libraries in the province.[11] The cities of Regina and Saskatoon were not considered because "standards and documentation are available for measuring the services offered by these libraries against those of similar libraries elsewhere."[12] Standards developed by the task force were approved, in draft form, at the SLA annual general meeting in 1978, were shortly published, and rapidly sold out. A second, revised edition appeared in 1979. The two documents deal with quantitative standards, but also record in detail the various responsibilities of differently sized units within the system and their relationships to each other and to headquarters. Hence the goal of each unit is defined in practical terms, as it serves its purpose within the system. In this way, one is given a clear picture of the intent of the system in toto. While dealing essentially with regional systems, certain "givens" are, however, noted: that university, college and public library services will continue to serve as backups; that school and public library services will continue to complement one another; and that the provincial library will continue its function as a central coordinating agency.

Quebec's Ministère des Affaires Culturelles, Service des Bibliothèques Publiques, published *Normes pour les Bibliothèques Municipales* in 1974, and revised them some time later.[13] These standards provide a very detailed qualitative and quantitative expansion of a memorandum promulgated by the Quebec Ministry of Cultural Affairs in 1973: "Dans le but de nous donner un instrument de mesure conforme à nos besoins, le service des bibliothèques publiques entreprendra en 1974, avec la collaboration des spécialistes des bibliothèques publiques, la preparation d'un document précisant les normes de service que doit s'éfforcer d'atteindre chaque bibliothèque subventionée."[14] Services deemed necessary are recorded in great detail along with the administrative and budgetary support to achieve the service, and the personnel and collections needed to ensure proper provision. Cooperation among public libraries and between school and public libraries is encouraged, as is continuing education for library staff. Model policy statements are described and numerical specifications included, with the result that the

Normes provide both a philosophical and practical guide for the effective development of public library service in a province which, in the past, has been largely sustained by the parish library.

The revised *Normes* restate the principles developed in the original document; elaborate and, where appropriate, metricate the specifications; are printed instead of duplicated; and otherwise indicate little or no change. However, in his article "Présent et Futur du Réseau des Bibliothèques Publiques du Québec," Yvon-André Lacroix demonstrates statistically the wide margin which exists between the standards and the reality.[15]

Newfoundland, which has many problems in public library service still to resolve, not least in the areas of finance and public transportation, has only recently essayed standards meeting its own needs. "Library Standards," a mimeographed 1980 publication by the Newfoundland Public Libraries Board,[16] resembles the British Columbia publications for small libraries in providing guidance toward the provision of basic library service in the more remote communities.

Ontario has published no standards in the last decade, but much has been happening among the public libraries of that province, and a well-established tradition of stimulating surveys continues. At the end of 1974, the Ontario Provincial Library Council appointed A.W. Bowron of Information, Media and Library Planners to make a detailed study of the public library situation in the province. The report, *The Ontario Public Library: Review and Reorganization*, was published in December 1975.[17] The information gathered, which included a detailed historical review of public library development 1964-74 and comprehensive statistical tables, was to form the basis for a plan to bring about "the organization, financing and coordination of public libraries and outline a phased development plan valid for at least the next ten years."[18] Among other things, Bowron recommended the division of the province into seven planning regions, and the creation, where necessary, of federated library systems within the planning regions. He also viewed as necessary the identification and funding of major city libraries as resource libraries. In all, an integrated cooperative network was envisaged.

Such coordination implies a need for standards, and Bowron noted the temptation to lay out standards then and there, but conceded that: "to be effective they must represent a broad consensus, an agreement acceptable to, not the lowest, but the median library administrator. Standards should arise out of discussion and be acceptable to the provincial government, the O[ntario] P[ublic] L[ibrary] B[oard], the libraries

in the federated systems and the important public library organizations. They also must be rooted in a feeling for public needs for library resources and information."[19] He recommended, however, that qualitative standards "based on and coordinated with others accepted officially in Canada and internationally"[20] be drawn up. Thereafter, quantitative standards should be drafted and set in place, and if not met, would result, as in British Columbia, in the withholding of grants.

The report precipitated considerable controversy throughout Ontario, but to date no new legislation has resulted from it. Interest in improved legislation still exists, however, in Ontario government circles, for in 1981 an Ontario Public Libraries Programme Review (OPLPR) was set in motion. A review team coordinated by Peter Bassnett, director of Scarborough Public Library, has been crisscrossing the province to hear briefs, meet members of the library community, gather data and identify concerns—in short, to reexamine "legislative, financial, structural and organizational concerns that could affect future library service."[21]

Between the Bowron and the OPLPR reports, Ontario should have the most detailed picture of its library condition in the country, and a base par excellence for the formulation of provincial standards—which might, in turn, be of great service nationally.

The most significant development bearing on public library standards in Canada as a whole has been the preparation and publication in 1981 of *Project Progress: A Study of Canadian Public Libraries.* This has been a slowly evolved research study (funding being the essential problem) sponsored by CLA and begun in 1979. The study examined in general and in particular the ways in which public libraries have been affected by changing social, economic and demographic circumstances. Both the terms of reference and the steering committee for the project emphasized the need "to supply a base of practical information that public library planners and decision-makers would find useful in understanding and dealing with the current and future status of the public library service in Canada."[22] Accordingly, through examination of source materials, questionnaires and interviews, sampling from all areas of the country, statistics dealing with the quantifiable aspects of librarianship were assembled and analyzed, and impressions gathered of how public library workers perceived themselves as library workers, and how they perceived and reacted to change in library services. The resulting compilation is by far the widest sampling and presentation of data reflecting the whole Canadian public library scene that has so far been achieved, and provides a very necessary data base from which new

CLA standards may be developed. Most recommendations suggest how public libraries may cope most effectively with internal change and develop the most appropriate services to individual communities. Two of the recommendations, however, deal specifically with standards and standardization:

> Recommendation No. 8. We recommend that professional librarians in the public library service form a national organization equivalent to a licensing or testing body. There is a lack of structure in the profession that allows the incursion of forces outside the profession to impinge upon such areas as the definition of work and the establishment of standards.
> Recommendation No. 9. We recommend that the boundaries between tasks performed by professional librarians and those carried out by technicians and other workers be defined, maintained and standardized across library systems.[23]

These recommendations recognize both the lack of useful, wide-ranging standards and the imperative need for such standards. In addition, they take into account the need for standardization within certain areas, to allow for cooperation and mobility among libraries and even within an individual library or system. *Project Progress* may be seen as Canada's response to that need for new approaches recognized and met in the United States by the recent ALA *Planning Process for Public Libraries.*[24]

Florence Murray mentions, at the end of her description of the rapid development in university and college libraries prior to 1972, a draft report entitled *Trends for the Seventies: Guidelines for Canadian University Libraries.*[25] (The subtitle, *Guidelines,* brings out yet another aspect of the terminological difficulty attached to any discussion of standards and specifications. Some standards may actually be seen to be model procedure manuals and policy statements.) These guidelines were the result of two years of work by a Canadian Association of College and University Libraries (CACUL) committee chaired by Daniel Reicher, and were presented to the Association in June 1971, at which time they failed to gain ratification. A new committee was formed in 1972, but no report has since been forthcoming.

It may be that the timing was wrong, as CACUL was on the verge of schism and subdivision. The head librarians of the larger universities shortly formed themselves into the Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL), and the residue of CACUL divided into two groups: those representing librarians attached to degree-granting institutions on the one hand, and those working in community college libraries on the other. Thus, *Trends for the Seventies,* geared predominantly to the

larger academic institutions, may have failed by falling between stools. The research institutions, still elevated by the divine afflatus induced by the heady budgets of the sixties, may have considered the guidelines to be inhibiting rather than helpful, while the smaller institutions—degree-granting and otherwise—doubtless considered them to be well beyond their reach, and hence irrelevant.

Moreover, *Trends for the Seventies*, a forward-looking document, may have been born before its time. It recommended fundamental change in traditional outlooks. It suggested that "academic librarianship in Canada is facing a crisis of identity with libraries finding it increasingly difficult to chart courses in the face of 'future shock' and with no rationalized goals toward which to steer."[26] The authors recognized that they were proposing no more than a provisional model, but they hoped it would stimulate research, which in turn would produce "generalizations and a rationalized philosophy of librarianship"[27] and, in due course, standards for the eighties. In the outcome, these standards—albeit unofficial—are the only standards for the eighties that have been offered academic libraries, and as such they warrant attention.

Rationalization of library collections is suggested at the broad end of the scale—a prophetic and practical suggestion.[28] At the very specific end, the average amounts of time required to process a single volume are indicated.[29] Also, the academic and professional qualifications of particular staff members at particular salary levels are detailed.[30] The vital importance of long-range planning is repeatedly stressed;[31] because of this awareness of the future, the document, particularly in its qualitative sections, bears reconsideration. In the financially troubled eighties, the sections proposing and explaining collection rationalization might be very useful indeed.

The cause of collection rationalizaion was further promoted by John Ettlinger in a paper presented at a CACUL workshop in June 1973.[32] Although Ettlinger is not dealing specifically with standards and specifications, the tenor of his paper is that there should be common goals and united effort. This implies a shift in the precise specifications each institution would need to effect a change in its methods of achieving standards.

In any event, the only concrete standards developments on the postsecondary institutional library scene emanated from community college libraries and the libraries of the new Quebec Collèges d'Enseignement Général et Professionel (CEGEP). The community college standards, at least, represent an outgrowth from the 1965 *CACUL Standards* rather than from *Trends for the Seventies.*

Canadian Standards

In 1973 CACUL published *Standards Recommended for Canadian Community College Libraries.*[33] Two types of standard, the qualitative and the quantitative, are listed. The eight types of college libraries to which these standards are applicable are specified. The qualitative standards are very broad, recognizing the multiplicity of physical and intellectual requirements of each type of college. To some extent, this is advantageous and allows for flexibility. But terms like "adequate space," "sufficiently high" budget, and hours of service to meet "reasonable demands" are subject to almost infinite interpretation. Lacking working definitions, it is possible that the standards might be so differently interpreted, not just from library to library, but by successive administrations, that they would cease to be standards. Though they lack the clear focus of *Trends for the Seventies*, the college standards can certainly be applied in the eighties, but they can hardly be seen as actively forward-looking and adaptable. Rather, their generality may tend toward causing great gulfs between the quality of library service in one college library and that in another. The quantitative specifications are such that, though still quite broad, they do not seem to provide for increased use of nonprint material, automation, and the accompanying hardware and professional and paraprofessional expertise. Most interestingly, as the majority of technicians are college-trained, no provision is made for their presence as specially equipped staff members, or indeed at all.

The much more detailed *Normes des Bibliothèques de CEGEP*[34] were published by the Fédération des CEGEP, Commission des Coordonnateurs de Bibliothèques in 1974, having been formally approved by the commission in 1973. Here standards are dealt with at a philosophical level, and more concrete specifications are included, making the *Normes* potentially long-lived. Although designed for largely French-speaking institutions in a specific province, it seems likely that these standards could be more widely used. The administrative structures supporting each kind of college library seem not to be totally at variance, nor the ascertainable objectives at odds.

School libraries, too, were provided with a useful, though not entirely new, document for the seventies. This was *Resource Services for Canadian Schools,*[35] edited by F.R. Branscombe and H.E. Newsom, jointly sponsored by the Association for Media and Technology in Education in Canada and the Canadian School Library Association (a division of CLA), and published in 1977. The book, as the preface notes, was prepared as the successor to *Standards of Library Service for Canadian Schools* (1967), produced by the CSLA, and *Media Canada: Guidelines for Education* (1969) by the Educational Media Association of

Canada.[36] From 1972 until 1977, the two associations were collaborating on a fresh, integrated definition of the role of the library in the school, preparing and providing learning materials of whatever medium or format. Ideas and information were sought from more than seventy leading school librarians and audiovisual specialists; draft versions of the manuscript were sent for criticism and correction to a panel of consultants; and every effort was made to ensure trans-Canada input and applicability.

Inevitably, a "national" program for school libraries can only suggest directions in which services should be developed, and specifics concerning personnel, materials and equipment, facilities, funding, etc., needed to support such a program, since education is a provincial responsibility. If not specifically a book of standards, the publication is a very useful handbook for anyone faced, with or without formal library training, with the duty of managing a school library.

The sector of special libraries may be seen by some to be too diverse to operate well within standards. However, in the mid-seventies, two examples of standards for special libraries, the first very precisely focused, the second more broadly based, were produced. At the end of 1974, "Canadian Standards for Hospital Libraries,"[37] was approved by a wide range of associated bodies, from the Health Sciences Division of the Canadian Association of Special Libraries and Information Services (CASLIS) to the Board of Directors of the Canadian Medical Association. The standards envisage the health sciences library as an intrinsic part of the hospital unit, whose ultimate goal is the best possible patient care. Given the very clear idea of the purpose of the hospital, it is relatively easy to define the library's place within the hospital, even allowing for different types and sizes of institution. The standards cover the usual topics: objectives, organization and administration; staffing and personnel qualifications; nature and scope of services; facilities and equipment. It is emphasized that they are recognized as minimal—sometimes being surpassed in extant hospitals, but more often being demonstrably higher than the service offered in many institutions across Canada. It is also pointed out that the information would be useful to community health centers and other health-related facilities, but not to patient libraries (which relate rather to public libraries).

Standards for a wide range of special libraries within the government of Alberta were produced a year after the highly specific hospital library standards. In 1975 the Alberta Government Libraries' Council (AGLC) published *Standards and Specifications for Alberta Government Special Libraries.*[38] Clearly, and in both qualitative and quantita-

tive terms, it details policies and procedures necessary to operate a special library within a system of government libraries. In spite of the highly specialized nature of the libraries it was designed to sustain, this document should be—indeed, is—valuable to many different varieties of special library. One of the reasons for this is the diversity of the Alberta government's special libraries, which deal with a great range of subject areas and have been established to deal, individually, with an equally wide range of users. At the time of writing, the AGLC includes, among many others, the libraries serving the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology and the Alberta Vocational Centre, and libraries supporting such government departments as Alberta Environment, the Solicitor General, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Alberta Culture, and Alberta Agriculture—a distinctly diverse group as to both holdings and patrons.

While the bulk of libraries in the public domain are under provincial jurisdiction, the federal government mandates and supports the National Library of Canada, founded in 1953, in providing both leadership and support to the libraries—especially the research libraries—of Canada. The development of a national union catalog was one of the first tasks undertaken by the National Library. Implicit in such an activity was the formulation and adoption of standards, which led in due course to the creation, within the National Library, of the Office of Library Standards. This office is concerned with the evaluation and evolution of both national and international bibliographic standards, to improve internal library systems and to contribute both to Canadian and universal bibliographic control, through work with IFLA and the International Organization for Standardization, and through participation in such activities as AACR revisions.[39]

The National Library has realized "that research and development for automation must be done on a national and international level in order to design formats which facilitate the exchange and communication of bibliographic data in machine-readable form between organizations and to develop automated systems which are compatible and provide for the fullest exchange of information."[40] This has resulted in the development of Canadian MARC, with its special bilingual feature, which accords with international MARC specifications.

In a 1979 recommendation, *The Future of the National Library of Canada*,[41] submitted by Dr. Guy Sylvestre, National Librarian, to the Canadian Secretary of State, national networking needs are further spelled out, the two top priorities being identified as a decentralized bibliographic network and a concomitant resources network which

would link catalogs and data banks. This document, substantially endorsed by CLA in 1980, has obvious implications for future standards formulation.

Cooperation among libraries across the country and all segments of the information industry is seen as vital, along with the need for standardized messages and procedures. National Library thinking on these matters is explained in *The Context of Interconnection for a Nation-Wide Bibliographic Network* (1980).[42] A task force on Computer/Communication Protocols for Bibliographic Data Interchange has been appointed to recommend standards appropriate to Canadian libraries which will fit the Open Systems Interconnection model of the International Standards Organization.[43] The degree of success these activities are likely to achieve will probably be commensurate with the amount of funding provided by the federal authorities to promote cooperation in the field.

Concern for a degree of standardizaion is also evinced by CLA in its dealings with educational programs for library personnel. Again, provincial control of education means that a national organization can only approve or recommend; enforcement can be dealt with only at the provincial level. However, CLA has continued to avail itself of the services of the ALA Committee on Accreditation, and only graduates of ALA-accredited institutions are automatically considered professional in Canada. Accreditation requirements, while permitting considerable flexibility in programs (exemplified in Canada by the massive move to the two-academic-year MLS as first professional degree), do assume the meeting, if not surpassing, of basic standards in knowledge and skill in professional matters. This common denominator must have its effect as graduates enter the field.

The training of library technicians, developing from local needs, has been a much more ad hoc operation, initially achieved with little library input and less professional blessing. However, in due course, the CLA Education for Library Personnel Committee's Subcommittee for the Training of Library Technicians took cognizance of the situation, began to visit and report on training programs, and subsequently drew up "Guidelines for the Training of Library Technicians" which were endorsed by CLA as official policy.[44] Since that time (1973), all programs in anglophone Canada have followed these guidelines as closely as their individual administrations permit. Improved relations with the library profession have also been effected by the establishment—as recommended in the "Guidelines"—of Local Advisory Committees (essentially composed of librarians) for each program and, if appro-

priate, where there are several programs available, of Provincial Committees as well, who may make recommendations to provincial governments.[45] Thus, CLA has in effect much more direct input in technican education than in professional library education. Curiously, few extant standards or specifications make provision for the ready incorporation into library operations of the technician. Consequently, this valuable source of highly and specifically trained manpower is frequently either under-used, exploited or, to all intents and purposes, ignored.

In 1981 the Canadian School Library Association produced *A Recommended Curriculum for Education for School Librarianship*,[46] dealing with diplomas in school librarianship—M.Ed. and MLS. The recommended curriculum suggests not so much standards for libraries, as it does a way in which to achieve standards for a particular type of librarian—a valid approach, given the facts that school librarians come within different provincial jurisdictions, and that specific school libraries operate at different levels to serve different student bodies. To produce an individual designed to function effectively within a range of circumstances may well be an excellent way to cope with the question of standards.

It must by now be evident that the Canadian approach to standards has changed little in the last decade—unless *Project Progress* sets our faces in a new direction. Murray's observation that standards "promote the development of service that makes possible new objectives that in turn demand new standards"[47] still holds good. Standards-shapers look around for successful operations and striking new initiatives, and offer directions as to how they may be emulated, rarely allowing for local differences. But the declining role of libraries in today's universe of information suggests that emulation of the best of the status quo, however impressive that best may be, is insufficient for our needs now—still less for our needs through the eighties. *Trends for the Seventies* noted that, "Ideally, universally valid standards should derive from basic research, still insufficient, in the field of information science."[48] The need for that research is even more urgent today than it was in 1971.

References

1. Murray, Florence B. "Canadian Library Standards." *Library Trends* 21(Oct. 1972):298.
2. Ibid., p. 309.
3. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, s.v. "standard."

4. Ibid., s.v. "specification."

5. Urban Dimensions Group. *Project Progress: A Study of Canadian Public Libraries.* (Prepared for the Canadian Library Association and the Canadian Association of Public Libraries.) Ottawa: Canadian Library Association, 1981.

6. Library Development Commission. *Quantitative Standards for Public Libraries.* Victoria, B.C.: LDC, 1968; 2d ed., 1973; 3d ed., 1978.

7. Ibid., 2d ed., p. 1.

8. Library Development Commission. *Standards for Integrated Library Systems.* Victoria, B.C.: Queen's Printer, 1973.

9. Ministry of Recreation and Conservation. Library Services Branch. "Reading Centres: Requirements and Standards." Victoria, B.C.: MRC, 1978.

10. Ibid., p. 1.

11. Saskatchewan Library Association. Task Force on Standards. *Standards for Libraries within Regional Library Systems in Saskatchewan.* Regina: SLA, 1978. (2d rev. ed., 1979.)

12. Ibid., p. 4.

13. Ministère des Affaires Culturelles. Service des Bibliothèques Publiques. *Normes pour les Bibliothèques Municipales.* Quebec: MAC, 1974. (rev. ed., n.p., n.d.)

14. Ibid. (1974), p. iii. "With the aim of giving us an instrument of measurement suitable for our needs, the public library service will undertake in 1974, with the collaboration of public library specialists, the preparation of a document specifying the standards of service which each subsidized library should strive to achieve."

15. Lacroix, Yvon-André. "Présent et Futur du Réseau des Bibliothèques Publiques du Québec." *Documentation et Bibliothèques* 25(Dec. 1979):177-88.

16. Newfoundland Public Libraries Board. "Library Standards." Mimeographed. St. John's: NPLB, 1980.

17. Bowron, Albert W. *The Ontario Public Library: Review and Reoganization.*(Prepared for the Ontario Provincial Library Council, Dec. 1975.) Toronto: Information, Media and Library Planners, (1975).

18. Ibid., p. 6.

19. Ibid., p. 173.

20. Ibid., p. 174.

21. Siulys, Ruta. "Team Winds Up Second Stage." *Feliciter* 27(Oct. 1981):1.

22. Urban Dimensions Group, *Project Progress*, p. 2.

23. Ibid., p. 103.

24. Palmour, Vernon E., ed. *A Planning Process for Public Libraries.* Chicago: ALA, 1980.

25. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries. Library Standards Committee. *Trends for the Seventies: Guidelines for Canadian University Libraries*, 2d draft report. Montreal and Toronto: CACUL, 1971.

26. Ibid., p. 4.

27. Ibid., p. 6.

28. Ibid., p. 49.

29. Ibid., p. 65.

30. Ibid., p. 19.

31. Ibid., p. 57.

32. Ettlinger, John R.T. "Nation-Wide Rationalization of Acquisition Policies in Canadian College and University Libraries: Are Total World Coverage and Non-Duplication of Resources Part of an Impossible Dream?" (Paper presented at CACUL Workshop on Collection Development, 16-17 June 1973, Sackville, N.B.) Ottawa: Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, 1973. (ED 087 492)

33. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries. *Standards Recommended for Canadian Community College Libraries.* Ottawa: CACUL, 1973.

34. Fédération des Collèges d'Enseignement Général et Professionel. Commission des Coordonnateurs de Bibliothèques. *Normes des Bibliothèques de CEGEP*. Montreal: CEGEP, 1974.

35. Branscombe, Frederic R., and Newsom, Harry E., eds. *Resource Services for Canadian Schools*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill/Ryerson, 1977.

36. Canadian School Library Association. Standards Committee. *Standards of Library Service for Canadian Schools*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1967; and Miller J.D., ed. *Media Canada: Guidelines for Education*. Toronto: Pergamon of Canada, 1969.

37. Flower, Muriel A., et al. "Canadian Standards for Hospital Libraries." (Final draft.) 1974.

38. Alberta Government Libraries' Council. Standards and Specifications Committee. *Standards and Specifications for Alberta Government Special Libraries*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1975.

39. "National Library of Canada/Bibliothèque Nationale du Canada." Ottawa: Information Canada, 1974.

40. Ibid., p. 30.

41. National Library of Canada. *The Future of the National Library of Canada/l'Avenir de la Bibliothèque Nationale du Canada*. Ottawa: NLC, 1979.

42. Buchinski, Edwin J., and Islam, M. *The Context of Interconnection for a Nation-Wide Bibliographic Network* (Canadian Network Papers No. 1). Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1980.

43. "NL Studies National Network." *Feliciter* 27(March 1981):3.

44. *See* Marshall, John. "Summary of a Survey of Library Technician Training Programs in Canada." *Feliciter* 19(April 1973 supp.):7-10.

45. Wiehs, Jean R. "The Library Technician." In *Canadian Libraries in a Changing Environment*, edited by Loraine Spencer Garry and Carl Garry, pp. 421-41. Toronto: York University Centre for Continuing Education, 1977.

46. Canadian School Library Association. *A Recommended Curriculum for Education for School Librarianship*. Ottawa: CSLA/CLA, 1981.

47. Murray, "Canadian Library Standards," p. 309.

48. CACUL, *Trends for the Seventies*, p. 3.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Standards for British Libraries

ANTHONY VAUGHAN

LIBRARIANS EVERYWHERE TRY to establish standards of service and performance as a means of securing recognition of the value of libraries and of library work from society in general. But they may go about this task in rather different ways. In countries like the United States, where libraries are dependent upon a multiplicity of bodies, public and private, and where there is no central agency to coordinate library development or to standardize salary scales, then it is the librarians' professional association which takes the lead in devising and publicizing appropriate standards.

In other countries, like some of those in Western Europe, most librarians may be employed by national public bodies at uniform or comparable conditions of service. Here standards are often promulgated by the central government in the form of statutes, decrees or regulations, and so the efforts of librarians are directed toward putting pressure on central government agencies to formulate standards acceptable to the profession.

In the United Kingdom the nature of library standards falls somewhere in between these two contrasting models. As Britain is not a federal country, the influence of the central government on publicly funded libraries may be direct or indirect but is always present. So professional bodies like the Library Association, 80 percent of whose members work in the public sector, spend much effort in lobbying government bodies on behalf of libraries in an attempt to influence

Anthony Vaughan is Senior Lecturer, School of Librarianship and Information Studies, Polytechnic of North London, England.

government decisions. Often the seeds sown by these efforts fall on stony ground, or take many years before showing signs of growth, or, to extend the metaphor and to apply it to recent years, the fragile seedlings wither from the frosts of an economic recession, but such methods are seen as indispensable and as important for securing recognition of adequate levels of library provision as the drawing up *in vacuo* of a document setting out standards for libraries.

Types of Standards

So in order to understand the development of standards for various kinds of British libraries, it is necessary to go beyond the publications of the Library Association or other professional bodies. More precisely, we can identify five types of documents relevant to our purpose.

First, there is the traditional type of library standard, issued by a professional body and devised by a committee, section or group of the same.

Second, there are what the Library Association calls "policy statements." Usually short, and without quantitative data, these statements are issued by professional associations as a way of staking a claim for the recognition of libraries and library services in areas where they may not be generally recognized or fully established. Such statements, if acted upon, could later be followed by a full set of quantitative standards. An example of a policy statement is one issued by the Library Association on library services to ethnic minority groups.[1] In the following account these policy statements will be mentioned only briefly and selectively.

Third, we have reports or recommendations issued by government bodies or commissions. Thus, the government department responsible for public health may advise hospital authorities to establish libraries of a certain standard, without, however, compelling them to do so. Or, the government department concerned with education in Scotland may ask a committee to examine Scottish school libraries and report back, without, however, committing itself to implement the report's recommendations. Naturally, librarians attempt to influence what is said in these documents. Sometimes they will be directly represented on these bodies; sometimes they will have no direct representation but will give evidence to them, and the report may closely reflect the evidence submitted. Thus a committee appointed to look at the teaching of English in British schools produced a 500-page report which included a chapter devoted to school libraries.[2] This chapter strongly supported, by detailed facts and figures, the case for good school libraries and leaned very heavily on the

evidence submitted to it by the Library Association and the School Library Association. Even though there is no guarantee that the government will act on the recommendations of these documents, they nevertheless remain recommendations of a more or less official nature which can be cited with some effect when circumstances warrant.

Fourth, the government may impose standards directly on libraries. Usually it influences libraries indirectly through the amount of money that it allocates to their parent organization, but, at least in the case of library buildings, it is not above setting its own norms.

Fifth and last are those documents issued by accrediting or validating bodies. Though such statements have been important in the past, there is little to say about this category of document in the period since 1971.

Before embarking on a more detailed consideration of British library standards, a word needs to be said about librarians' status, salaries and conditions of service. The salaries of librarians working in the public sector are usually linked to nationally-agreed salary scales. The Library Association has consistently tried to get professional librarians onto suitable scales, for example, to have college librarians paid on faculty scales rather than administrative ones. This is clearly an important way of defending the status of librarians and, indirectly, of libraries, but such documents will not be considered further in this review.

Developments Since 1971 Affecting Library Standards

A survey of British library standards appeared in *Library Trends* in 1972,[3] so this review will be largely confined to recording developments of the last decade. While the 1960s had in general been a period of expansion for all types of libraries, the 1970s saw, increasingly, cuts in public expenditure which badly affected libraries in the public sector. Sometimes, therefore, it seemed less appropriate to write new standards than to defend existing ones. Yet at the same time many of the advances in librarianship of the previous decade had come to some sort of fruition in the 1970s, and so were considered suitable for standardization. There was also an increasing interest in international standards, and the IFLA standards for public libraries, referred to elsewhere in this issue, were regarded as particularly relevant for Britain.[4] We may also note an increasing dissatisfaction with the traditional type of library standard; in its place, it was argued, standards of performance should be developed. As this debate took place mainly among public librarians, it will be referred to in a little more detail in the next section.

PUBLIC LIBRARY STANDARDS

General Standards

Although the Library Association has a long record of support for public libraries, it has not itself recently published general standards for them. It was left to a working party appointed by the government, but composed principally of librarians, to draw up detailed standards which were published in 1962.[5] Early in the period of the present review, the Department of Education and Science (the government department with a watching brief over public libraries) did attempt to monitor the 1962 standards to see how far they had been attained. It looked at library expenditures for the eight years 1965-73, and concluded that "a steady improvement in the achievement of standards will be noted in the tables."[6] But more recently, some local authorities, in their enthusiasm for cutting library budgets, have allowed their libraries to fall far below the levels recommended in the 1962 document, and no action has been taken by the central government.

The government's most systematic contribution to public library standards has been on staffing.[7] It commissioned a body called the Local Authorities Management Services and Computer Committee (generally known as LAMSAC) to investigate the numbers of staff needed to perform a variety of typical library tasks. Using work-study techniques, the investigators derived a host of formulas based ultimately on such figures as size of population served, size of stock, number of items circulated, and so on. Although the work was not intended to be a standard, it has been frequently cited by the Library Association in their guidelines and standards. The government itself, however, has made little attempt to tell cheese-paring local authorities to match their staff ratios with those recommended in the report.

Meanwhile, a group of public librarians had been approaching the whole matter from another direction. Standards, they thought, were inadequate in defining the purpose and object of the library, from which all else should flow. Accordingly, in 1971 they issued a short statement entitled "Public Library Aims and Objectives," as a basis, they said, of a nationally acceptable standard. This document was itself heavily influenced by a management technique known as corporate planning, and consisted of a hierarchy of statements beginning with one "aim," divided into four "objectives," twelve "sub-objectives," and so on. Anticipating criticism of what might be seen as a rather heavy-handed approach to the matter, the authors state: "to anyone who has not previously been concerned with corporate planning, what follows

may look like a statement of the obvious. In fact it represents almost a year's concentrated work by the Group, who considered three different approaches before going back to their original ideas."[8]

More recently this Public Libraries Research Group (PLRG) has been deriving a kind of performance measurement tool from these objectives and has applied it to more specialized aspects of the library service. A document on children's libraries contains a useful list of objectives, but deliberately eschews the setting down of anything quantitative. For example, among the "targets" which children's librarians should aim at is one which says that they should "ensure that books and material wanted by children are available at once in *n*% of cases."[9] But no value is given to *n*, the figure being filled in, if at all, by the local library. Statements in a similar vein dealing with public relations and adult reference services have also recently been produced by the group.[10]

Implicit in the approach of both the LAMSAC team and the PLRG was a critique of the traditional library standard. Traditional standards are standards of inputs: number of books, number of staff, size of buildings, for example. The PLRG believed that proper standards can be achieved only by assessing the output, or performance, of the library. Traditional standards, too, are based on the librarian's professional evaluation of what constitutes a desirable level of service. The LAMSAC study, however, had preferred to use the techniques of scientific management to obtain its results.

The way was then open for a new approach to library standards, one that would combine an emphasis on performance so strongly supported by PLRG with the systematic collection of managerial information such as was done by LAMSAC. The "public library planning process" devised by King Research in the United States[11] was thought to be the answer by some, and its report was used experimentally in Britain in two libraries.[12] But the sheer amount of data requiring collection (to say nothing of their interpretation) posed problems, and of course, the setting of objectives is a political, not a technical matter, and comprises statements of value, not of fact. Will this new approach replace the more traditional standard based on inputs? A lengthy discussion would be out of place in a general survey such as this, and the reader is referred to a useful recent paper by Moore.[13]

More Specialized Public Library Standards

While the debate over the means of assessing the adequacy of public library service went on, the Library Association and other bodies were establishing more specialized standards and guidelines.

In 1981 the association produced *Guidelines for Reference and Information Services to Public Libraries in England and Wales,*[14] setting out the requirements, scope and organization of a reference service, and the accommodation, stock and staffing levels considered to be necessary for its successful functioning. The standards update an earlier document of 1969, but they reassert the traditional role of the reference service and of the reference librarian. They have been criticized by some public librarians for neglecting recent developments in community information, advice and referral work, professional ethics, and electronic means of communication, as well as for their heavy reliance on inputs to the detriments of outputs or standards of performance.

In the 1960s and 1970s, some British public librarians showed rather more concern for the provision of services to those most clearly subject to social and economic discrimination, or to personal misfortune—the poor, the inner-city dwellers, the ethnic minority groups, the handicapped, the sick. Guidelines on services to these categories of people were issued by the Library Association and other bodies. One more detailed than most examined community information, making a well-substantiated claim for the library to participate in this new but rapidly growing service, and setting out in detail the measures to be taken to set up a library-based community information service.[15]

These initiatives by public libraries were well summarized in a document entitled *The Libraries' Choice,* produced by an advisory body to the government.[16] The "choice" of the title was apparently whether libraries should sit back and respond to expressed demand, or whether they should make substantial commitments to the provision of services to the powerless. In a lengthy series of recommendations, the report urged librarians to make much greater efforts to reach poor, sick or handicapped people. As the report was published by the government, it might be presumed to carry some weight. In a short preface the Department of Education and Science hoped "that the report will receive serious consideration by library authorities and that, although the report does not call for additional expenditure, its findings and suggestions will be borne in mind when authorities take decisions on the allocation of available resources."[17]

Though the tone was favorable, it was scarcely a ringing endorsement of the recommendations, and its tepid language contrasts oddly with the report's own concluding paragraph:

> As a final point we stress the urgency attached to our recommendations. At no time in public library history has it been more essential

> for the library service to re-assess its aims and its practice. During times of economic hardship the public library service becomes more important, not less, to the community as a whole and especially to those who without some help are effectively barred from its service.[18]

ACADEMIC LIBRARY STANDARDS

All British full-time institutions of higher education, with one exception, are public institutions and receive all or most of their money from public funds. They have all been affected by government policies, and the latter have undergone a veritable *volte-face* in the last decade. A government document of 1970 predicted a doubling of student numbers in fourteen years,[19] but soon after, the expansion slowed and institutional budgets were held steady or reduced. By 1981 it looked as if the higher education sector, which was already admitting a smaller proportion of the student age-group than almost any other industrialized country, would be forced to contract as fast as it had expanded in the 1960s.

In this increasingly inhospitable climate, academic librarians' first concern was to convince their governing bodies that their libraries were an indispensable part of the institution and so should be protected from the worst effects of the government's policy.

University Library Standards

University libraries were perhaps the first to feel the full effect of change in government policies in the shape of having standards of a most unwelcome sort thrust upon them. All but one of Britain's forty-five universities receive most of their public funds from a government-appointed body called the University Grants Committee (UGC). The UGC had long prescribed building standards for university libraries, but in 1976 a working party of the committee proposed, subject to certain exceptions, that they should withdraw material from their collections at a rate virtually equal to their acquisitions, and introduced the now-notorious (and misleading) term, the "self-renewing library."[20]

The new standards allowed universities library space at the rate of $1.25m^2$ per full-time equivalent (FTE) student. In addition, libraries would be granted $0.2m^2$ per FTE student for acquisitions up to ten years ahead, and a further amount to accommodate any existing special collections of rare and valuable material. If the library found this space insufficient for its needs, then a reserve closed-access store could be built,

purchased or rented, on or off campus, large enough to hold five years' acquisitions. When that was full, the library would have to start discarding at a rate comparable to its acquisitions. The report was greeted with cries of outrage, for it directly challenged the age-old belief that it was right and proper for a university library to grow in size.

Although universities have a precise legal definition in Britain, they are remarkably heterogeneous in size and status. While Oxford and Cambridge number their library collections in millions, other university libraries have fewer than 200,000 volumes in their collections. No full set of standards has ever been published for university libraries, and it is probably this diversity which has frustrated attempts to do so. Directors of university libraries have formed their own organization, the Standing Conference of National and University Libraries (SCONUL), which circulates recommendations and norms for particular activities among its members, and tries to defend the interests of university libraries by lobbying Members of Parliament and sending memoranda to the UGC.

The only other standard about university libraries much quoted in the 1970s was the statement in the Parry Report of 1967 that universities should devote a minimum of 6 percent of their income to their libraries.[21] Once again the sheer diversity of the institutions made this a rather unrealistic norm. Several universities regularly spent more than 6 percent on their libraries, and others considered that they had very good reasons for spending less. In 1980, SCONUL concluded that "the Conference should not now declare a policy on the norm since circumstances varied so greatly in member universities."[22]

British universities have not traditionally been greatly concerned with providing courses for other than their own full-time students, but about half of them do have an "extramural" department which provides courses for adults, often in towns and cities well away from the university's own campus. These courses need library support, and in 1978 the Library Association, with its traditional interest in adult education, issued a set of standards for university extramural libraries.[23] Its recommendations are based on good existing practice, give guidance on numbers of titles and copies of books necessary for each course and on better financial arrangements for the backup libraries, and advise university librarians to let adult students taking courses for credit borrow from the main university library collections.

Polytechnic Library Standards

Polytechnics are a much less diverse group than universities. Created in the period 1969-73, the thirty-one polytechnics differ from universities in providing a greater proportion of vocational and professional courses; in accepting part-time students in large numbers; in giving less attention to research; in having, very often, less satisfactory accommodation; and in having to submit their proposed degree programs to an outside validating body called the Council for National Academic Awards. Hitherto they have been funded and controlled not by a national body, but by local authorities.

No standards specifically for polytechnics have been issued since those of 1968, which were discussed by Humphreys in the earlier review.[24] When published, these standards were thought to be ambitious, even unrealistic. Today they seem quite unexceptional; many polytechnic libraries have in fact gone well beyond many of the Library Association's recommendations, and only the staffing levels still seem generous.

As SCONUL did not invite polytechnic library directors to join their organization, the latter set up their own body, the Council of Polytechnic Librarians (COPOL), which acts as a pressure group for the defense of these libraries in the same way as SCONUL, though on a smaller scale. Like SCONUL, COPOL circulates privately various recommendations on a number of matters, such as building standards.

College Library Standards

Besides the universities and polytechnics, the United Kingdom possesses several hundred other colleges, nearly all run by local authorities, but differing widely in age, size, status, and types of program offered. Generally, the bookstocks do not exceed 100,000 volumes, with a correspondingly modest staff complement. One group of them, the teachers' colleges, called colleges of education, had developed as learning resource centers in quite a big way, and the Library Association issued several policy statements defining this new role for the library, with a general statement appearing in 1973.[25] In the last ten years most of these colleges of education have been either closed down, merged with polytechnics, or asked to broaden their program by including arts and science courses, but the tradition lives on in the successor institutions.

Faced with these and other organizational changes, the Library Association approved a comprehensive set of new guidelines in 1981.

The opening paragraphs of the new document explain the general approach:

> Firstly while this document, in common with its predecessors, sets out what the Library Association believes to be desirable and necessary levels of library provision in colleges, it also includes an indication of the type and quality of service that college managements may expect of their libraries in return for these resources. Secondly the levels of provision suggested are not purely theoretical values. They describe instead actual levels of provision in some of the better institutions, and are therefore standards that are already being applied in colleges.[26]

The document repeatedly stresses the services it believes college librarians can offer, and generally seeks to confirm the outgoing involvement with college education programs which some college librarians had managed to achieve in the preceding decade. Suggested figures are given for the size of the collection, the acquisitions budget, the number of staff, and the physical accommodation required, all based on FTE student numbers and the academic level of the courses offered. But the general emphasis is less on quantitative criteria and more on the range and quality of the services that the library can offer. The standards are also applicable to polytechnic libraries, though many of them will find that they have already exceeded the suggested stock levels and staffing ratios, while the space norms are more generous than those currently permitted by the government.

SCHOOL LIBRARY STANDARDS

The basic realities of school librarianship in Great Britain can be summarized by the following statements:

1. There are about 28,000 publicly funded schools in Britain which educate 94 percent of the school population (the remaining 6 percent being education in private establishments, some of which are confusingly known as "public" schools).
2. In the vast majority of these schools there are collections of books which can be termed, even if flatteringly so in some cases, a school library.
3. There are about 600 working school librarians with professional library qualifications.

The professional librarians are to be found in the secondary schools—about 13 percent have a qualified librarian. For the remainder, and for

all primary schools, it is a teacher who is in charge of the library, and it is the local public library which provides a technical and bibliographical backup service. With so many teachers looking after so many school libraries, it is not surprising that they have their own organization, the School Library Association (SLA), a body quite distinct from the Library Association.

Both associations have published standards and guidelines for school libraries. The Library Association's latest document of 1977 makes its recommendations according to the size of the school and the age of the pupils. If we take as an example a secondary school of 1000 students aged eleven to eighteen, then the minimum library stock should be 14,000 items, with a staff complement of at least three—a professional librarian, a media technician and a clerical assistant.[27] It also gives guidelines for the school library service of the public library, but here it can recommend a staffing ratio of only three professional librarians to eighty schools.

The most recent policy statement of the School Library Association of 1980 lists the duties of the person responsible for the library at some length.[28] If this person is a teacher, then the teacher should be ranked as head of the department, should have appropriate clerical and technical help, and should be relieved of most or all of his/her teaching duties. ("Failure to do this is a notable, long-standing and deplorable weakness in the British educational system."[29])

Of the two documents, that of the Library Association is the more general and the more comprehensive, but the SLA statement is more vividly written and down-to-earth. The Library Association is in something of a quandary over the staffing of school libraries. To come out strongly in favor of professional librarians in all British schools might appear utopian and could be seen to slight the work not only of the teacher-librarians, but also of the public library's backup service. On the other hand, to suggest that the teacher-librarian system is satisfactory would be tantamount to admitting that professional librarians are not required in school libraries.

A government report on schools in Scotland did, however, come out firmly in favor of professional school librarians in all Scottish secondary schools with more than 600 pupils. The report noted that, at the time, there were only 70 school librarians in Scotland, and that the acceptance of its recommendation would mean the finding of another 350 as quickly as possible.[30]

All parties are united, however, in their concern for falling school library standards. County education departments are slashing what remains of school library budgets, and acquisitions are often running at

a rate about one-third of the Library Association's recommendations, to judge from a recent government study.[31] Organizations concerned with promoting the sale of books, like the National Book League, have also examined school library provision carefully, and have found declining standards almost everywhere.[32]

STANDARDS FOR SPECIALIZED LIBRARIES

Although there are many special libraries in Great Britain, only a few categories have had standards issued for them. Business and industrial libraries are too diverse and, in any case, too closely tied to their parent body for general standards to have much relevance. The same can be said for the libraries of the departments and agencies of the central government, save that there is some standardization in staffing, as most of the librarians working in such libraries are civil servants.

Hospital and Health Sciences Library Standards

The country's public health services are organized by the Department of Health and Social Security of the central government and are known as the National Health Service. The service is wide-ranging and includes general and specialized hospitals, general medical practice, and community and preventive health services.

The role of libraries in the National Health Service has been set out by the Library Association in two documents—one a policy staement, the other a series of guidelines.[33] They replace an earlier set of standards issued in 1965 and revised in 1972. The guidelines stress that health service librarians, though usually based in hospitals, should see themselves as providing a service for the whole health district. Recommendations cover patients' libraries, libraries for medical and nursing staff, and domiciliary services to the patient at home. Quantitative standards are based on the size of the hospital. For example, a 600-bed hospital should have a patients' library of 5400 volumes, with about 1100 volumes added annually; a professional medical library in the same hospital should have a stock of about 5000 monographs and should subscribe to at least 150 journals; and together these libraries need at least three qualified librarians. In Britain, the public library can, and usually does, provide a backup service (as we have already seen for schools), and the figures assume that the larger resources of the public library will be available to the hospital librarians.

The compilation of the recommendations was not an easy task. The relationship between the patients' library and the medical staff library is somewhat controversial, but the guidelines support a single administrative structure for all hospital library services, stressing, perhaps for the benefit of hospital administrators, the economies which can thereby be achieved. They also advocate, though more cautiously, the physical juxtaposition, or even integration, of patients' and staff libraries.

Prison Library Standards

The formal position of the prison library service may be summed up by quoting the first paragraph of the first official Library Association standards for prison libraries, which appeared in 1981:

> The average daily population of people in custody in England and Wales approximates to 44,000. They are held in 118 prison establishments provided and maintained by the Home Office....Library facilities are provided in every establishment by arrangement with local public libraries. In all, 52 public library authorities are involved in the service. They are reimbursed by the Home Office at a nationally applied per capita rate at a level agreed with local authority associations.[34]

The Library Association document had been preceded by a policy statement from the Home Office in 1978.[35] The latter had been drawn up with the advice of librarians working for the Department of Education and Science, and had been more positive and more explicit on the importance of library services than most other similar government documents.

The Library Association guidelines give minimum stock figures, and recommend the inclusion of periodicals, large-print books, materials of interest to ethnic minority groups, nonprint media, etc. Indeed, the range of stock should correspond, say the guidelines, with that obtaining in a public library and with the prisoners' interests, save that the ultimate responsibility for what goes on the shelves rests with the prison governor. Operational control of the library is in the hands of a Prison Educational Officer, while the professional librarian should be present part-time, the recommended hours ranging from a minimum of ten hours per week for a small jail up to thirty hours a week or more for a prison with over 850 inmates—the figures being taken from the LAMSAC report.

Standards for Libraries Specialized by Subject

The particular organizational and bibliographical characteristics of music, art, medical, law, etc., libraries are not often adequately dealt with by general public or academic library standards. Two British examples of more specialized, subject-based library standards are mentioned here.

In 1973 the Art Libraries Society (ARLIS) published a set of standards for the provision of art materials in public, academic, special, and national libraries, and described them as an "interim statement."[36] Because of the great variation in the purpose and size of such libraries, general standards of a quantitative nature were not laid down. The document stresses, however, the special requirements of art departments in libraries, and recommends a degree of administrative and budgetary autonomy for them, as well as subject qualifications in art for the professional art library staff. It details the special accommodation required for the storage and consultation of such material as portfolios, posters, slides, and so on, and the special categories of material that art libraries need to acquire, like sale catalogs and illustrations.

ARLIS as a separate professional body was founded in 1969; the same year saw the birth of the British and Irish Association of Law Librarians (BIALL). Work on standards for law libraries in the British Isles was begun in 1974 and completed in 1981.[37] BIALL's document is directed in part at organizations which may be unfamiliar with law libraries and their services, and in part at librarians wishing to set up or develop a law library. For the first purpose, the standards lay much stress on the importance of the library, and of the skills possessed by qualified librarians. For the second purpose, they contain much practical detail which is continued in a series of appendixes which amount to a virtual manual of law library practice.

The standards are intended to cover all types of law library, ranging from those in universities to those run by small specialist law firms. Formulas are given for the number of staff, and the titles necessary for a basic collection are listed in an appendix. Services are not neglected, either, but the documents note that "library staff are not normally qualified to give legal advice and should not do so."[38]

CONCLUSION

In this survey of British library standards, I have passed in review various categories of documents. But just what effect have these documents had?

At a practical level, standards continue to be of great value. For a particular governing body considering the establishment of a new library service, or for an individual librarian, many standards provide valuable practical information, and for this alone they are worth compiling.

Viewed as a symbolic justification for libraries and their services, standards have also had their effect. They serve to inform society that librarians can undertake particular activities with professional competence, and they can alert society to new roles which librarians can play. Governing bodies, even when they cannot fund new ventures, may support certain services, the importance of which has been described in policy statements or standards. For example, the document setting new directions for the British public library, entitled *The Libraries' Choice*, was followed by no direct government action; but when the chairwoman of the committee that wrote it was asked whether it had had any effect, she could reply that it had helped to convince some economy-minded town halls that library service to the powerless and the handicapped was not just a fringe activity which could be conveniently cut out to save money.[39]

If, however, we regard standards as attempts to upgrade libraries up and down the country, it is difficult not to be pessimistic. A specific government policy and a deep economic recession have certainly resulted in declining standards. It is small comfort to most librarians that government policies for cutting public expenditure have so far explicitly excluded agencies concerned with war and with law and order, and so, perhaps for that reason, the future looks reasonably bright for prison libraries. Library standards are of no avail when libraries' controlling bodies have to cut their budgets; libraries, like all the other departments, suffer the consequences. The curious decision by the Library Association no longer to call its standards "standards," but to refer to them as "guidelines" or "recommendations" instead, seems likely to weaken rather than strengthen the force of these documents. Bodies which take little notice of "standards" are likely to take even less notice of "guidelines."

In the last few years a completely new way of establishing effective standards for libraries has been put forward. The Library Association, SCONUL, and other professional bodies have been urging the government to develop a national policy for library and information services. Such a national policy has never before existed in Britain, but supporters of the idea believe that it would result, in effect, in the state itself supporting and enforcing adequate standards for libraries. But there are dangers as well as opportunities here, and whether this national policy

could accomplish more than the publication of traditional standards only time will tell.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am very grateful to the British and Irish Association of Law Librarians and to Mr. W.W.S. Breem, chairman of its standards committee, for allowing me to see the draft standards for law libraries before they were published. I am similarly indebted to Mr. Rennie McElroy and Mr. Philip Plumb of the Colleges of Further and Higher Education Group of the Library Association for sending me a copy of their draft college library standards.

This survey could not have been written adequately without the help and insights received from the writer's colleagues at the Polytechnic of North London, particularly Margaret Redfern and Terry Beck (public libraries), Joy Lewis (health services and prison libraries), and Eleanor von Schweinitz (school libraries).

Finally, any writer on British library standards has his or her work made much easier thanks to the labors of L.J. Taylor, whose monumental *Librarian's Handbook* (2 vols.; 1976, 1980) reprints or summarizes most of the documents published up to 1979 which are mentioned in this study.

References

1. Library Association. *Public Libraries in a Multicultural Britain*. London: LA, 1977. (Summarized in *Library Association Record* 79(Jan. 1977):47.)

2. Great Britain. Department of Education and Science. *A Language for Life*. Bullock Report. London: HMSO, 1975.

3. Humphreys, Kenneth W. "Standards for Libraries in Great Britain." *Library Trends* 21(Oct. 1972):312-29.

4. International Federation of Library Associations. *Standards for Public Libraries* 2d ed. London: K.G. Saur, 1977.

5. Great Britain. Ministry of Education. *Standards of Public Library Service in England and Wales*. London: HMSO, 1962.

6. Great Britain. Department of Education and Science. *Libraries and Their Finance*. London: HMSO, 1975, p. 23.

7. *See* Local Authorities Management Services and Computer Committee. *The Staffing of Public Libraries* (Library Information Series, no. 7), 3 vols. London: HMSO, 1976.

8. Public Library Research Group. "Public Library Aims and Objectives." *Library Association Record* 73(Dec. 1971):233-34.

9. Brown, Roy. "Performance Measurement, I: Children's Services (Excluding School Services)." *Library Association Record* 81(Sept. 1979):455. *See also* _____. "Public Library Aims and Objectives." *Library Association Record* 81(Aug. 1979):382.

10. Usherwood, R. "Public Relations." *Library Association Record* 82(April 1980):167-69; and Harrison, D.J. "Adult Reference Services: A Value Statement." *Library Association Record* 83(June 1981):286.

11. Palmour, Vernon E., et al. *A Planning Process for Public Libraries*. Chicago: ALA, 1980.

12. Dyson, C. *A Planning Process for Public Libraries: Report on the Planning Manual* (British Library Research and Development Department Report No. 5541). London: British Library, 1980.

13. Moore, Nick. "Standards versus Performance Measurement." *Public Libraries* 20(Winter 1981):99-102.

14. Library Association. *Guidelines for Reference and Information Services to Public Libraries in England and Wales*. London: LA, 1981.

15. Working Party on Community Information. *Community Information: What Libraries Can Do*. London: Library Association, 1980.

16. Great Britain. Department of Education and Science. Library Advisory Council. *The Libraries' Choice* (Library Information Series, no. 10). London: [England]. HMSO, 1978.

17. Ibid., p. 1.

18. Ibid., p. 44.

19. Great Britain. Department of Education and Science. *Student Numbers in Higher Education in England and Wales*. London: HMSO, 1970, pp. 36-37.

20. University Grants Committee. *Capital Provision for University Libraries: Report of a Working Party* (Atkinson Report). London: HMSO, 1976.

21. _____ . *Report of the Committee on Libraries* (Parry Report). London: HMSO, 1967, pp. 148-56.

22. Standing Conference of National and University Libraries. *Annual Report, 1980*. London: SCONUL, 1981, p. 22.

23. Library Association. *Standards for University Extra-Mural Libraries*. London: LA, 1978.

24. _____ . "Libraries in the New Polytechnics." *Library Association Record* 70(Sept. 1968):240-43; *see also* Humphreys, "Standards," p. 321.

25. _____ . *Library Resource Centres in Schools, Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education*. London: LA, 1973.

26. _____ . *College Libraries: Guidelines for Professional Service and Resource Provision*. London: LA, 1982.

27. _____ . *Library Resource Provision in Schools: Guidelines and Recommendations*. London: LA, 1977.

28. School Library Association. *The Way Ahead: The Organization and Staffing of Libraries and Learning Resources by Schools in the 1980s*. Oxford: SLA, 1980.

29. Ibid., p. 20.

30. Great Britain. Scottish Education Department. *Non-Teaching Staff in Secondary Schools: Youth and Community Workers, Librarians, Instructors* (Stimpson Report). Edinburgh: HMSO, 1976.

31. Great Britain. Department of Education and Science. *Statistical Bulletin No. 7/81: Secondary School Library Survey*. London: DES, 1981.

32. National Book League. *Books for Schools*. London: NBL, 1979.

33. Library Association. *Library Support for Health Care Services: A Policy Statement*. London: LA, 1980; and _____ . *Guidelines for Library Provision in the Health Service: A Consultative Document*. London, LA, 1978 (reissued with amendments, 1980).

34. _____ . *Prison Libraries: Library Association Guidelines for Library Provision in Prison Department Establishments*. London: LA 1981.

35. Great Britain. Prison Department. *Library Facilities for People in Custody* (Policy Statement, no. 7). London: HMSO, 1978.

36. Art Libraries Society. "Standards in Art and Design Libraries." *ARLIS Newsletter* 14(March 1973):2-9.

37. British and Irish Association of Law Librarians. "Standards for Law Libraries." *Law Librarian* 12(Dec. 1981):i-xvi.

38. Ibid., p. ix.

39. Corbett, Anne. "Why Bother about the Handicapped?" *Library Association Record* 83(Sept. 1981):413.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

International Standards

PETER HAVARD-WILLIAMS

IN THE *Library Trends* article on this topic ten years ago, Otto Löhmann wrote:

> Rationalization is the motto in libraries today, as it has been for a long time in commerce, technology and industry. An explosive development in the fields of research and information and a very small reservoir of human working capacity make absolutely necessary an economical utilization of all possibilities in library work and documentation.[1]

For "rationalization" read "resource sharing," and the paragraph still stands for the decade 1971-81. As was pointed out in the symposium on Resource Sharing of Libraries in Developing Countries, "Resource sharing is an omnibus expression to cover cooperation, coordination, inter-library loans, cooperative acquisition, cooperative cataloguing."[2] For resource sharing or rationalization (call it what you will), standardization on an international scale becomes more and more necessary, especially when the pressures due to a world recession are all the greater. The role of international institutions equally becomes more and more important, and we have, in the past decade, seen a considerable amount of effort spent on the development of standards.

With the development of standards, we have also seen a more critical approach to the general question of standards. Already in Otto Löhmann's article, the distinction was made as follows: "Standards may be of material, quantifiable nature, but they may also be nonmate-

Peter Havard-Williams is Professor and Head, Department of Library and Information Studies, Loughborough University, Loughborough, England.

rial, intellectual, or, expressed in another way, qualitative (e.g., international definitions)."[3] The *Oxford English Dictionary* gives several definitions of *standard*, two of which are particularly apposite. The first is an "exemplar of measure...—the authorized exemplar of a unit of measure,...preserved in the custody of public officers as a permanent evidence of the legally prescribed magnitude of the unit"; secondly, "an authoritative or recognized exemplar of correctness, perfection, or some definite degree of any quality"; and finally, "a definite level of excellence, attainment, wealth, or the like, or a definite degree of any quality, viewed as a prescribed object of endeavour or as the measure of what is adequate for some purpose." Similarly, the adjective is defined as "serving as a standard of measurement, weight or value...serving or fitted to serve as a standard of comparison or judgement."[4]

Warwick S. Cathro, in a recent article has distinguished between customary and *ex-cathedra* standards.[5] The former are those which are in common use already, such as the Roman alphabet; the latter, those which have received formal or quasi-legal status following publication by a national or international body, such as International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA), International Standards Organization (ISO), or Association Française de Normalisation (AFNOR).

In a recent paper on "Standards, Objectives and Guidelines for School Libraries," Arthur Jones distinguishes between *standards* (for example, the standard for A4 paper, 210 x 297mm), and *guidelines*: "If I follow your guidelines precisely they will at least enable me to repeat an experience and a level of performance which you have achieved in the past."[6] In point of fact, many standards in the field of library and information science have been a codification of the best practice known, and they have been formulated over several decades on this basis. However, the influence of science generally, and management science in particular, appears to have influenced attitudes toward standards, so that a distinction is being made between those standards which are precise, e.g., measurements for catalog cards or paper sizes, and those which concern standards of service ("guidelines") and are expressions of the best practice known at the time (and therefore subject to revision as practice improves).

Arthur Jones adds "objectives" to "standards" and "guidelines," and suggests that the latter are based on the experience of the past, while objectives look to the future. " 'Management by objectives'...asks, where are we going? and only then, how are we to get there? What are our resources? What are our priorities?"[7] The application of standards, then, depends on the reaction to them by individual institutions, or in

the case of international standards, by national agencies of one kind or another.

It appears to be the case that we have expected too much of "standards," for there has been a tendency to retain the word *standards* in titles—*Standards for Public Libraries*—even though the points discussed are in the nature of "guidelines." Arthur Jones mentions "objectives," and, as he points out, these look to the future rather than to the past. So do other planning programs, such as Management by Objectives (MbO) or Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems (PPBS), while performance appraisal is the assessment of such programs in the light of the experience of what has actually happened, and with a view to further programs of planning. Nick Moore, in an interesting paper to the Australasian Library Conference in 1981, suggests that, in practice, standards "are being overtaken and replaced by performance measurement techniques." In other words, modern management practices are making standards irrelevant. His conclusion is that there is still a place for standards, but that "the traditional reliance on standards promulgated by others has been diminished by a growing reliance on systems which encourage the exercise of local autonomy in the formulation of objectives and the measurement of performance."[8] This conclusion, however, may be correct for industrialized countries with well-developed library systems, but the fact remains that standards of some kind are required for international practice.

The growth of standard formulation has also led to further analysis of their status. The international body for the promulgation of standards is the International Standards Organization (ISO) which depends on the various national standards institutions for significant input. It is these bodies that produce standards which have official status. But as standards become more pervasive, nonofficial, or certainly nongovernmental, bodies, such as IFLA or FID, increasingly promulgate standards which are accepted in practice as international standards, though these may not be regarded as official standards by the issuing bodies. Indeed, Unesco's *Unisist Guide to Standards for Information Handling*, part 2, is titled "Guide to Normative Materials," *norm* indicating French influence as equivalent to *standard* (as in *Association Française de Normalisation*) and also East European influence (as in "fulfilling one's norm ").

Standards, norms, guidelines, then, appear in the information field to be of three kinds:

1. technical standards of measurement, e.g., catalog cards, technical equipment;

2. technical standards for the layout of documents, e.g., ISBDs; and
3. guidelines for attainment of performance, e.g., standards for public libraries.

Those of the first variety, of course, affect activities broader than information, though they are fundamental to basic practice. The most important developments in the last decade, however, have been in the field of cataloging, and the amount of literature on the topic reflects this.

Standardization in cataloging goes back to the Anglo-American rules of 1908, for this was the first essay in international cooperation in this field.[9] With the publication of the American revision of 1949,[10] attention was given to the principles underlying cataloging practice, with the final result of the Conference on Cataloguing Principles held in Paris under the auspices of Unesco, under the inspiration of IFLA in 1961. This gave rise to further consideration of cataloging principles, including the *Statement of Principles,*[11] and the development of the remarkable Universal Bibliographic Control program formulated by Dorothy Anderson for the NATIS Conference of 1974.[12] This has proved to be the springboard for a program of fundamental international importance, and a series of publications has ensued which has transformed cataloging practice worldwide.[13] The International Standard Bibliographic Descriptions, while not regarded as standard by the IFLA International Office for UBC, are regarded as such for descriptive cataloging by others, including both ISO and Unesco (which in itself gives them a semiofficial status). Similarly, the manuals and guides published by the same office have served as exemplars for cataloging practice internationally. The UBC Office has also published a number of items relating to machine-readable cataloging. On the other hand, Warwick S. Cathro, while recognizing the preeminence of IFLA in this field and acknowledging the increased activity of ISO with regard to international standards in documentation, identifies limits in their influence:

> An inevitable result of rapid change has been the failure of national agencies to comply with the most modern or the most international standards. As examples of non-compliance, the UNIMARC format is not being used for international exchange: the ISO 3166 country codes are not used in our MARC records; there is no plan to implement the new ISO extended roman character set (ISO/DIS 5426); and the ISO transliterations for Cyrillic and other scripts are being ignored. In addition, compliance with ISBD, *AACR2* and even *AACR1* has been late, patchy or heavily qualified.[14]

Problems of standardization in serials, including the relationships of ISBD(S) and the title main entry, and of ISDS and ISBD(S) and AACR are dealt with in a series of articles,[15] while Stevens deals with the special field of Asian serial literature, and points out how wide the differences are in the state of bibliographic control, and how Asian librarians are seeking to make their views known in the formulation of international standards.[16]

An important historical perspective on standardization in cataloging is afforded by Doralyn Hickey,[17] who shows the dominance of the United States up to World War II. Thereafter, participation was broader, resulting in the Paris conference in 1961, and American influence has diminished, the initiative being taken by IFLA, as already indicated.

In an article on "Normative Activities in the UNISIST Programme," Löhner[18] drew attention to the standardization programs which are directed toward interconnection among information systems. In 1973, for example, Unesco published *Guidelines for Monolingual Thesauri* to foster the development of compatible thesauri for the transfer of information among information agencies in different countries.[19] As a help toward standards in indexing, Unesco published a draft document on indexing principles.[20] The attempt made here is to develop principles independent of any particular information system. Sutter wrote a paper which includes descriptions both of the ISONET thesaurus and the ISONET manual.[21] ISONET, as the ISO's network, can now come into operation with these two essential tools.

Helmut Felber[22] describes current work in terminology centers on the standardization of terminology and the coordination of terminological activities, and draws attention to the importance of the work of ISO/TC 37. He also refers to the work of Infoterm. Also at the same congress, J. Laurent[23] reported on the use of the terminology standardized at AFNOR, while Derek Austin[24] reported on progress toward standard guidelines for the construction of multilingual thesauri.

Subject problems were also considered at a seminar sponsored by the British Council, the British Library and the Library Association,[25] as were various means for expressing subject information on machine-readable records. Desiderata for a future system should include the admission of new terms in the vocabulary, meaningful relationships among terms, and the use of neutral codes to represent specific concepts.

Margaret Park[26] reviewed international standardization from an American point of view and gave a state-of-the-art review of standardization related to libraries, abstracting and indexing standards, and data element standardization, thus continuing Schmierer's review.[27]

The importance of an international approach to technological knowledge was emphasized in the proceedings of a seminar on industrialization in developing countries in 1978[28] which included problems of international standardization in scientific and technological information work. E.J. French drew attention to the importance of testing and evaluating standards, and to methods for observing standards from the initial proposal to publication and subsequent implementation.[29] The state of international standardization in the field of information and library activities was seen from an East European point of view by Vajda and Ottavay[30] in a report to the ISO/TC 46 meeting held in Brussels in May 1976 about current work and work outlined for the future.

The impetus of further recognition for international standards has come from publications by both ISO and Unesco. In 1977 the ISO Information Centre, with the sponsorship of Unesco within its UNISIST program, published the ISO Standards Handbook 1 *Information Transfer*. The introduction states that "Standardization at the international level...is recognized as an absolute necessity for practical and financial reasons."[31] The work includes standards for bibliographic references and descriptions, abstracts and indexing; presentation of documents; conversion of written languages; document copying and microforms; bibliographic control (ISBN and ISSN); libraries and information systems; mechanization and automation in documentation; classification and controlled languages for information storage and retrieval; and terminology (principles). There are also a number of draft standards, and a listing of ISO standards in numerical order. Reference to ISBD(M) is made in draft DIS 5962. The same year, the Information Centre also published *International Standards for Documentation and Terminology*.[32] This includes the same headings as the previous volume, and gives in part I the titles of standards for which the full text is found in the *Handbook*. In part II, however, are given "International standards and normative documents developed by other international organizations." These include the *UNISIST Guidelines*,[33] ISBD(M) and ISBD(S), and various INIS standards (for descriptive cataloging, abstracts, terminology and codes for countries, authority lists, etc., and FID Universal Decimal Classification).

The UNISIST program of Unesco has given a considerable impetus to the publication of guidelines in the realm of archive, documentation and libraries, now grouped in the General Information Program (itself an amalgam of the UNISIST and NATIS programs) under the comprehensive umbrella of "information." In 1980, again under the

auspices of the UNISIST program, Unesco published *UNISIST Guide to Standards for Information Handling*. The work was coordinated by the Section for the Promotion of Methods, Norms and Standards of the Division of the General Information Program of Unesco (under the direction of Wolfgang Löhner). In the introduction, it is recognized that there "is a need for information exchange between systems," and that from existing experience in this field, standards are being developed and "being applied in the development of Unesco's long-term standardization programme." Equally, it is recognized that the effectual application of this program requires "research to determine the needs; preparation of standards, methods and guidelines; adequate packaging and distribution; and promotion of application and advice."[34] Dissemination of the information about standards is regarded as important since, though international standards may be promulgated, they may not always arrive at the site required for implementation. However, it is also understood that "the adoption of new standards often means costly restructuring...financial considerations will dictate the solution of international standardization"[35] and standards will need to be updated.

The *Guide* has chapters on the preparation of documents and subject analysis, production of documents, reproduction of documents, representation of information, editing, bibliographic records, interchange of machine-readable bibliographic data, management of document collections, and numerical data, together with a bibliography. The text includes useful guidance on the sources of information on standards and guidelines in the various subjects, and guides readers to the bodies responsible for the formulation of the standards. It is an indispensable tool for anyone concerned with international normalization in the information field. In addition, it includes references to numerous standard manuals and national standards (e.g., the AMA *Style Book and Editorial Manual*, 1971; the COSATI *Guidelines for Descriptive Cataloguing of Reports*, 1978; and NEN 690—1969 *Mappen en brievenhouders*).

The chapter on the "Interchange of Machine-Readable Bibliographic Data" brings us to a new aspect of the topic: "The transfer of bibliographic data in machine-readable form is now an essential part of the information transfer system." The chapter is concerned with a number of international formats either "established by an international organization and/or for an international information system" or "intended to be used on an international scale."[36] The text properly points out that these formats have historically been developed around two foci: libraries, and abstracting and indexing services. The contribu-

tion is noted of both the UNISIST International Centre for Bibliographic Descriptions (UNIBID) and IFLA, and attention is drawn to documentation on UK, MARC, LC MARC, and INTERMARC. However, the main thrust of the chapter concerns the development of work on data exchange formats, internal formats, and "an international exchange format which would be totally implemented—independent and hence truly universal," as recommended by the International Symposium on Bibliographic Exchange Formats.[37]

The use of international bibliographic standards with regard to specialist services is treated in several articles.[38] Activity in the field of pagination, titles, alphabetization, transliteration, and statistics is reported by Johanna Eggert.[39] This was the report of a meeting in Basel to coordinate the efforts of German-speaking countries.

A Unesco symposium for editors of documentation, library and archives journals was held in Budapest in 1972, during which concern was expressed about the application of ISO standards in this specialized field. An enquiry was conducted which sought information on conformity with the standards. Reports came from Singapore and Budapest.[40] Sviridov described programs of the World Intellectual Property Organization for the international standardization of patent documents and the development of new information retrieval methods. He drew attention to the Paris Union Committee for Cooperation in Information Retrieval Among Patents Offices (ICIREPAT), the International Patent Classification (IPC), and the International Patent Documentation Centre (INPADOC).[41]

Jerome Miller considered the problems of bibliographic citation for "previously published" microform copies. There is a lack of a system for citation for copies of previously published material, and he proposed the citation to the original work, accompanied by the microform citation in brackets. This citation consists of the microform type, microform publisher, microform series, and identifying number(s).[42]

Goulard looked at the state of microfiche standardization,[43] and Archard considered the broader picture in his paper, "A Question of Standards,"[44] presented to an Information Management Conference. He described the current situation for national and international standards, some of which are given in an appendix.

Baker discussed international standards for microforms.[45] He pointed out that these are dealt with by AFNOR, and ISO has formed a new committee, TC 171. This committee is working actively and has four working groups: WG1 is concerned with the physical characteristics of microforms and containers (United States), WG3 handles appli-

cations (Canada), WG4 is concerned with quality aspects (France), and WG5 with equipment (United States). Work continues, it is reported, on standards for microfilm readers and methods of testing, and on the legal acceptance of microforms.

The examination of magnetic tapes and their relevance to international information transfer was undertaken by Wilmot.[46] She looked at the physical characteristics of magnetic tapes, the presentation of data, and the record structure. She concluded that the most important area for information processing remains the overall bibliographic content. Martin Bloch and others[47] reported on the communicative format of data recording on magnetic tape and described the work of the International System of Scientific and Technical Information in Moscow. They are critical of ISO 2709—1973 *Format for bibliographic information interchange on magnetic tape*. Machine formats were the subject of a paper by Richard Coward[48] at the 1974 Western European Seminar on the Interchange of Bibliographic Information in Machine Readable Form. The standards program was discussed, together with the current situation and the lessons to be learned from the past.

Standards for university library buildings have been drawn up by a group appointed by the Nordrhein-Westfalen Minister for Science and Research.[49] Area requirements are stated for storage and display, readers' accommodation, etc. Planning factors and standards relating to university library buildings in developing countries have been considered by Peter Hoare.[50]

IFLA Standards for Public Libraries,[51] published in 1973, are the result of prolonged negotiation and study, arising out of the draft standards of 1956-58. In addition, the "Unesco Public Library Manifesto" appeared in a revised text, and the standards arise from the aims of the manifesto. The standards include units of administration and service, collections, special groups, staff, buildings, and the cost of the public library service. Provided one understands that standards are the formulation of the best current practice, and not a universal mathematical formulation, there need be no confusion between "standards" and "guidelines," which also appears in the text.

In Norway, standards for public library book stocks were formulated after consideration of norms in other countries and of local conditions. The standards would be difficult for smaller municipalities to meet, but may lead to improved selection.[52] Recommended minimum standards for secondary school libraries approved by the Singapore Ministry of Education are reported in *Singapore Libraries*.[53]

Lundin[54] reported on school library standards in 1973, based on the Commonwealth Secondary School Libraries Research Project Bulletin

No. 2, *On Establishing Standards*. He discussed two varieties of standard—quantitative and qualitative—together with evaluative criteria.

Standards for school libraries have been considered by the Danish School Library Association.[55] The report includes recommendations for "minimum standards" for book stock, audiovisual material, hardware, staffing, and arrangement of stock and premises. It also includes recommendations for joint collections with municipal libraries and regional centers, as well as a state center for technical materials.

Standards for technical institute libraries, hitherto neglected, were approved by the New Zealand Library Association in 1972.[56] New Zealand has also considered standards for libraries in health authorities: these include libraries both for patients and for staff,[57] while Mary Ronnie points out that the IFLA concept of patients' libraries as a public library responsibility is not realistic in New Zealand, where local government and health authorities have different areas of jurisdiction.[58]

Attention has also been paid to standards for library education. A revised text of the standards was approved by the IFLA General Council in 1976. This includes not only standards, but their genesis, philosophy and possibility for implementation. Schools should be at university level, should have stated goals, and the requisite financial support with the appropriate financial resources and accommodation. The curriculum should emphasize principles and concepts, rather than routines, while continuing education should be part of the program. There should be well-defined admission and qualification standards. Long-range planning is also essential.[59]

Edward Dudley examines the record of the IFLA Section on Library Schools critically and wonders, quoting Havard-Williams, whether worldwide standards can be anything more than banal. He also proposes topics for further discussion.[60]

It is evident in the last decade that the importance of standards has been enhanced, partly from a need for economy and efficiency, but also because of the development of information services, the increase in their importance in modern technological society, and hence their increased contact with technology itself—in particular, with computer processing. The coming decade will witness a continuation of this trend, particularly as developing countries make their presence more evident in the development of information activities.

References

1. Löhmann, Otto. "Efforts for International Standardization in Libraries." *Library Trends* 21(Oct. 1972):330.

2. Havard-Williams, Peter. "The Wider Implications of Resource Sharing." In *Resource Sharing of Libraries in Developing Countries* (IFLA Publications 14), edited by H.D.L. Vervliet, p. 41. Munich: K.G. Saur, 1979.

3. Löhmann, "Efforts," p. 331.

4. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "standard."

5. Cathro, Warwick S. "The Upheaval in Bibliographic Exchange Standards 1974-1984." *Australian Library Journal* 29(May 1980):59-66+.

6. Jones, Arthur. "Standards, Objectives and Guidelines for School Libraries." (paper presented to IFLA Section on School Libraries, 19 Aug. 1981), p. 2. (unpublished)

7. Ibid.

8. Moore, N.E. "Standards versus performance measurement" (Paper delivered at the 1981 conference of the joint Library Association of Australia/New Zealand Library Association). *Public Libraries* 20(Winter 1981):99-102.

9. American Library Association and Library Association. *Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries*. Chicago: ALA, and London: Library Association, 1908.

10. American Library Association. *Cataloguing Rules for Author and Title Entries*, edited by Clara Beetle. Chicago: ALA, 1949.

11. IFLA Committee on Cataloguing. *Statement of Principles Adopted at the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles*. Paris, Oct. 1961, edited by E. Verona. London: IFLA, 1971.

12. Anderson, Dorothy. *Universal Bibliographic Control* (COM. 74). Paris: Unesco, 1974; _____. *Universal Bibliographic Control* (IFLA Pub., NATIS/Ref. 3). Munich: Verlag Dokumentation, 1974; and _____. "IFLA's Program of ISBDs." *Unesco Bulletin for Libraries* 32(1974):144-50.

13. *See An Annotated Bibliography of the ISBD* (IFLA International Office for UBC Occasional Papers No. 6), 2d ed. rev. London: IFLA, 1980, for references to relevant ISBD publications. *See also*: Anderson, Dorothy. "IFLA's Programme of ISBDs." *IFLA Journal* 4(1978):26-33; and Gorman, Michael. "International Standard Bibliographic Description and the New ISBDs." *Journal of Librarianship* 10(1978):131-37.

14. Cathro, "The Upheaval," p. 59.

15. *See, for example*: Durance, Cynthia J. "International Serials Cataloging." *Serials Librarian* 3(Spring 1979):299-309; Bouffez, F., and Grousseaud, A. "Bibliographic Control of Serial Publications: ISDs, ISBD(S), and ISBD(M) as Cataloguing Aids." *Journal of Library Automation* 9(1976):137-44.

16. Stevens, R. "Access to the Current Serial Literature of Asia in the Humanities and Social Sciences." MLS thesis, Loughborough University of Technology, 1979.

17. Hickey, Doralyn J. "The Search for Uniformity in Cataloguing: Centralization and Standardization." *Library Trends* 25(Jan. 1977):565-86.

18. Löhner, Wolfgang. "Normative Activities in the UNISIST Programme." *International Forum for Information Documentation* 2(1977):37-39.

19. Unesco. *Guidelines for the Establishment and Development of Monolingual Thesauri* (SC/WS/555). Paris: Unesco, 1973.

20. "UNISIST: Indexing Principles." Paris: Unesco, 1975.

21. Sutter, Eric. "International Dissemination of Standards Information-Tools Needed to Operate the Network: The ISO Thesaurus and the ISO Manual. *Indexer* 11(1979):157-59.

22. Felber, Helmut. "International Efforts to Overcome Difficulties in Technical Communication." *In* Commission of the European Communities. *Third European Congress on Information Systems and Networks, Luxembourg, 1977*, vol. 1., pp. 86-99. Munich: Verlag Dokumentation, 1977.

23. Laurent, J. "Utilization of the Technical Terminology Standardized at AFNOR." In *Third European Congress*, vol. 1, pp. 189-211.

24. Austin, Derek. "Progress toward Standardized Guidelines for the Construction of Multilingual Thesauri." In *Third European Congress*, vol. 1, pp. 341-402.

25. Austin, Derek. "The exchange of subject information." In *The interchange of bibliographic information in machine readable form: papers given at the Western European Seminar on the Interchange of Bibliographic Information in Machine Readable Form*, edited by R.E. Coward and M. Yelland, pp. 68-81. London: Library Association, 1975.

26. Park, Margaret K. "Bibliographic and Information Processing Standards." *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* 12(1977):59-80.

27. Schmierer, Helen F. "Bibliographic Standards." *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* 10(1975):105-38.

28. *The Technological Knowledge Base for Industrializing Countries* (Proceedings of the NBS/AID U.N. Conference on Science and Technology for Development Seminar, 16-17 Oct. 1978). (NTIS Report PB-294 984).

29. French, E.J. "A Methodology for Testing and Evaluating Standards with Special Reference to Information, Documentation and Related Fields" (SC 75/WS/102). Paris: Unesco, UNISIST, 1976.

30. Vajda, Erik, and Ottovay, L. "A nemzetkoezi szabvanyositas helyzete a tajekoztatasi-koenyvtari." *Tudom. Muz. Tajek* 23(1976):413-17.

31. International Standards Organization Information Centre. *Information Transfer* (ISO Standards Handbook 1). Geneva: ISO, 1977, p. iii.

32. _____ . *Bibliography 7: International Standards for Documentation and Terminology*. Geneva: ISO, 1977.

33. UNISIST. *Guide to Standards for Information Handling*. Paris: Unesco, 1980. *See also:* _____ . *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Information Systems and Services* (PGI/78/IVS/18). Paris: Unesco, 1978; and United Nations. *United Nations Microfiche Standard*, rev. ed. (UN ST/PB/30). New York: United Nations, 1970.

34. UNISIST Working Group on Bibliographic Data Interchange. *UNISIST Guide Standards for Information Handling*, compiled by Erik Vajda. Paris: Unesco, 1980.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid., p. 169.

37. UNISIST International Center for Bibliographic Descriptions. *Towards a common bibliographic exchange format?* (International Symposium on Bibliographic Exchange Formats, Taormina, Sicily, 27-29 April 1978), edited by H. Dierickx and A. Hopkinson. Budapest/London: OMKDK-Technoinform/UNIBID, 1978. (Distributed by The Hungarian Central Technical Library and Documentation Centre, OMKDK-Technoinform, H-1428 Budapest, P.O.B. 12, Reczky v.6.)

38. *See, for example*, Gove, N. "Use of ISO Standards in INIS." In *Information Systems: Their Interconnection and Compatibility*, pp. 336-47. Vienna: International Atomic Energy Agency, 1975.

39. Eggert, Johanna. "Bericht über die Mitarbeiterversammlung des Fachnormenausschusses Bibliothek und Dokumentationswesen am 26 und 27 Nov. 73 in Basel." *Bibliotheksdienst* 12(1973):601-03.

40. Koevendi, Dénes. "The Presentation of Documentation, Library and Archives Journals and the ISO Standards." *Unesco Bulletin for Libraries* 29(July/Aug. 1975):206-19; and Leong, Alice. "The International Organization for Standardization's Recommendations on the Presentation of Documentation, Library and Archive Journals and the Singapore Libraries." *Singapore Libraries* 7(1977):13-17.

41. Sviridov, F.A. "International Patent Organisation." *Unesco Bulletin for Libraries* 32(Sept./Oct. 1978):315-21.

42. Miller, Jerome K. "A Proposed Statement of Bibliographic Citation for Microform Copies of Previously Published Materials." *Microform Review* 2(April 1973):97-98.

43. Goulard, C. "Où en est la normalisation dans le domaine de la microfiche?" *Bulletin du Cimab* no. 1, Jan. 1975, pp. 9-21.

44. Archard, T.N.J. "A Question of Standards" (paper presented to Information Management 1977 Conference, Hatfield Polytechnic, Hertfordshire, England, 14-16 Sept. 1977).

45. Baker, G.G. "International Micrographic Standards." *Microdoc* 18(1979):86-91.

46. Wilmot, C.E. *International Tape Standards for Documentation and Information Processing*. London: Aslib, 1977.

47. Bloch, Martin, et al. "Socialist Countries: Communication Format of Data Recording on Magnetic Tape." *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences* 17(1977):32-35.

48. Coward, Richard E. "Machine Formats." In *The Interchange of Bibliographic Information in Machine-Readable Form*, edited by Richard E. Coward and Michael Yelland, pp. 82-85. London: Library Association, 1975.

49. Mitteilungsblatt. *Verband der Bibliotheken des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen* 22(1972):268-74.

50. Hoare, Peter. "Consideration of Some Planning Factors and Standards Relating to Universities in Tropical Developing Countries." *Toklok Bilong Hans Bok* 25(1978):16-27.

51. IFLA Section of Public Libraries. *Standards for Public Libraries*. Munich: Verlag Dokumentation, 1973.

52. Nordgarten, Aud. "Norwegian Standards for Library Book Stocks." *Scandinavian Public Library Quarterly* 11(1978):13-17.

53. Standing Committee on Libraries (Ministry and Schools). Sub-Committee on Standards, comp. "Recommended Minimum Standards for Secondary School Libraries." *Singapore Libraries* 2(1972):67-73.

54. Lundin, Roy A. "On Establishing Standards for School Libraries." *Australian Library Journal* 22(1973):221-27.

55. Danish School Library Association. "Normes for skolebiblioteksomradet." *Børn and Bøger* 26(March 1974):1-46.

56. New Zealand Library Association. *Standards for Libraries in Technical Institutes* (adopted by the Council 9 November 1972). Wellington: NZLA, 1973; *see also* Coard, Lucy J. "Standards for Technical Institute Libraries." *New Zealand Libraries* 36(Aug. 1973):250-55.

57. New Zealand Library Association. *Standards for Library Services in Health Authorities*. Wellington: NZLA, 1978.

58. Ronnie, Mary A. "Standards for Library Services in Health Authorities." *New Zealand Libraries* 41(July 1978):55-56.

59. Standing Advisory Committee. Section of Library Schools. "Standards for Library Schools, 1976." *IFLA Journal* 2(1976):209-23.

60. Dudley, Edward. "IFLA and Library Education." *IFLA Journal* 3(Aug. 1977): 263-66.

Partial List of Library Trends Issues in Print*

				Title	*Editor*	*Date*
V.	11	N.	1	Library Boards	J. Archer Eggen	July 1962
	11		2	Bibliotherapy	Ruth M. Tews	Oct. 1962
	11		3	Law Libraries	Bernita J. Davies	Jan. 1963
	11		4	Financial Administration of Libraries	Ralph H. Parker Paxton P. Price	April 1963
V.	12	N.	1	Public Library Service to Children	*Winifred C.* Ladley	July 1963
	12		2	Education for Librarianship Abroad in Selected Countries	Harold Lancour J. Clement Harrison	Oct. 1963
	12		3	Current Trends in Reference Services	Margaret Knox Goggin	Jan. 1964
	12		4	European University Libraries: Current Status and Developments	Robert Vosper	April 1964
V.	13	N.	1	Research Methods in Librarianship	Guy Garrison	July 1964
	13		2	State and Local History in Libraries	Clyde Walton	Oct. 1964
	13		3	Regional Public Library Systems	Hannis S. Smith	Jan. 1965
	13		4	Library Furniture and Furnishings	Frazer G. Poole	April 1965
V.	14	N.	1	Metropolitan Public Library Problems Around the World	H.C. Campbell	July 1965
	14		2	Junior College Libraries	Charles L. Trinkner	Oct. 1965
	14		3	Library Service to Industry	Katharine G. Harris Eugene B. Jackson	Jan. 1966
	14		4	Current Trends in Branch Libraries	Andrew Geddes	April 1966
V.	15	N	1	Government Publications	Thomas S. Shaw	July 1966
	15		2	Collection Development in University Libraries	Jerrold Orne	Oct. 1966
†	15		3	Bibliography: Current State and Future Trends, Part 1	Robert B. Downs Frances B. Jenkins	Jan. 1967
†	15		4	Bibliography: Current State and Future Trends, Part 2	Robert B. Downs Frances B. Jenkins	April 1967
V.	16	N.	1	Cooperative and Centralized Cataloging	Esther J. Piercy Robert L. Talmadge	July 1967
	16		2	Library Uses of the New Media of Communication	C. Walter Stone	Oct. 1967
	16		3	Abstracting Services	Foster E. Mohrhardt	Jan. 1968
	16		4	School Library Services and Administration at the School District Level	Sara K. Srygley	April 1968
V.	17	N.	1	Group Services in Public Libraries	Grace T. Stevenson	July 1968
	17		2	Young Adult Service in the Public Library	Audrey Biel	Oct. 1968
	17		3	Development in National Documentation and Information Services	H.C. Campbell	Jan. 1969
	17		4	The Changing Nature of the School Library	Mae Graham	April 1969
V.	18	N.	1	Trends in College Librarianship	H. Vail Deale	July 1969
	18		2	University Library Buildings	David C. Weber	Oct. 1969
	18		3	Problems of Acquisition for Research Libraries	Rolland E. Stevens	Jan. 1970
	18		4	Issues and Problems in Designing a National Program of Library Automation	Henry J. Dubester	April 1970
V.	19	N.	1	Intellectual Freedom	Everett T. Moore	July 1970
	19		2	State and Federal Legislation for Libraries	Alex Ladenson	Oct. 1970
	19		3	Book Storage	Mary B. Cassata	Jan. 1971
	19		4	New Dimensions in Educational Technology for Multi-Media Centers	Philip Lewis	April 1971
V.	20	N.	1	Personnel Development and Continuing Education in Libraries	Elizabeth W. Stone	July 1971
	20		2	Library Programs and Services to the Disadvantaged	Helen H. Lyman	Oct. 1971
	20		3	The *Influence of American Librarianship Abroad*	Cecil K. Byrd	Jan. 1972
	20		4	Current Trends in Urban Main Libraries	Larry Earl Bone	April 1972
V.	21	N.	1	Trends in Archival and Reference Collections of Recorded Sound	Gordon Stevenson	July 1972
	21		2	Standards for Libraries	Felix E. Hirsch	Oct. 1972
	21		3	Library Services to the Aging	Eleanor Phinney	Jan. 1973
	21		4	Systems Design and Analysis for Libraries	F. Wilfrid Lancaster	April 1973
V.	22	N.	1	Analyses of Bibliographies	H.R. Simon	July 1973
	22		2	Research in the Fields of Reading and Communication	Alice Lobrer	Oct. 1973
	22		3	Evaluation of Library Services	Sarah Reed	Jan. 1974
	22		4	Science Materials for Children and Young People	George S. Bonn	April 1974

Partial List of Library Trends Issues in Print*

				Title	Editor	Date	
V.	23	N.	1	Health Sciences Libraries	Joan Titley Adams	July	1974
	23		2	Library Services in Metropolitan Areas	William S. Budington	Oct.	1974
	23		3	Music and Fine Arts in the General Library	Guy A. Marco Wolfgang M. Freitag	Jan.	1975
	23		4	Resource Allocation in Library Management	H. William Axford	April	1975
V.	24	N.	1	Federal Aid to Libraries	Genevieve M. Casey	July	1975
	24		2	Library Cooperation	Pearce S. Grove	Oct.	1975
	24		3	Community Analysis and Libraries	Larry Earl Bone	Jan.	1976
	24		4	Commercial Library Supply Houses	Harold Roth	April	1976
V. †	25	N.	1	American Library History: 1876-1976	Howard W. Winger	July	1976
	25		2	Employee Organizations and Collective Bargaining in Libraries	Margaret A. Chaplan	Oct.	1976
	25		3	Trends in Bibliographic Control: International Issues	Mary Ellen Soper Benjamin F. Page	Jan.	1977
	25		4	Trends in the Scholarly Use of Library Resources	D.W. Krummel	April	1977
V.	26	N.	1	Library Services to Correctional Facilities	Jane Pool	Sum.	1977
	26		2	Trends in the Governance of Libraries	F. William Summers	Fall	1977
	26		3	Institution Libraries	Harris C. McClaskey	Win.	1978
	26		4	Publishing in the Third World	Philip G. Altbach Keith Smith	Sprg.	1978
V.	27	N.	1	Films in Public Libraries		Sum.	1978
	27		2	State Library Development Agencies	John A. McCrossan	Fall	1978
	27		3	Libraries and Society	Phyllis Dain Margaret F. Stieg	Win.	1979
	27		4	Study and Collecting of Historical Children's Books	Selma K. Richardson	Sprg.	1979
V.	28	N.	1	Economics of Academic Libraries	Allen Kent Jacob Cohen K. Leon Montgomery	Sum.	1979
	28		2	Emerging Patterns of Community Service	Margaret Monroe Kathleen M. Heim	Fall	1979
	28		3	Library Consultants	Ellsworth E. Mason	Win.	1980
	28		4	Current Trends in Rural Public Library Service	John M. Houlahan	Sprg.	1980
V.	29	N.	1	Current Library Use Instruction	A.P. Marshall	Sum.	1980
			2	Library Services to Ethnocultural Minorities	Leonard Wertheimer	Fall	1980
			3	Map Librarianship and Map Collections	Mary Lynette Larsgaard	Win.	1981
			4	Public Lending Right	Perry D. Morrison	Sprg.	1981
V.	30	N.	1	Bibliometrics	William Gray Potter	Sum.	1981
			2	Conservation of Library Materials	Gerald Lundeen	Fall	1981
			3	Data Libraries for the Social Sciences	Kathleen M. Heim	Win.	1982
			4	Mental Health Information: Libraries and Services to the Patient	Phyllis Rubinton	Sprg.	1982
V.	31	N.	1	Standards for Library and Information Services	Terry L. Weech	Sum.	1982

* A complete list of back issues is avaliable from *Library Trends*, Publications Office, 249 Armory Building, 505 E. Armory Street, University of Illinois, Champaign, IL 61820.
† Also available in clothbound editions.

Library Trends

(ISSN 0024-2594)

LIBRARY TRENDS, a quarterly journal of librarianship, provides a medium for evaluative recapitulation of current thought and practice, searching for those ideas and procedures which hold the greatest potentialities for the future.

Each issue is concerned with one aspect of librarianship. Each is planned with the assistance of an invited advisory editor. All articles are by invitation. Suggestions for future issues are welcomed and should be sent to the Managing Editor.

Published four times a year, in summer, fall, winter, and spring. Office of publication: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 249 Armory Bldg., 505 E. Armory St., Champaign, IL 61820. Entered as second-class matter under the act of August 24, 1912.

Subscription price is $20.00 a year (plus $1.00 postage for overseas subscribers). Individual issues are priced at $5.00. All foreign subscriptions and orders should be accompanied by payment. Address orders to Journals Department, University of Illinois Press, 54 E. Gregory Drive, Box 5081, Station A, Champaign, IL 61820. Editorial correspondence should be sent to Publications Office—*Library Trends*, 249 Armory Bldg., 505 E. Armory St., Champaign, IL 61820.

Indexed in *Current Contents, Current Index to Journals in Education, Library and Information Science Abstracts, Library Literature, PAIS*, and *Social Sciences Citation Index*.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.